Two very lerned Sermons of M. Beza,

togither with a short sum of the sacrament of the *Lordes Supper*: Beze

Wherevnto is added a treatise of the substance of the Lords Supper, wherin is breflie and soundlie discussed the principall points in controuersie, concerning that question. By T. W. Ilcocke.

2. CORINTH. 13. 5.

Proone your selues whether ye are in the faith: Examine your selues. Know ye not your owne selues, how that Iesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobats?

AT LONDON
Printed by Robert Walde-graue, for T. Man, and T. Gubbins.
Anno. 1588.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1878

BX9426
B4T8
Office

TO THE RIGHT

honorable and verie ver-

tuous ladie, Brigit, counteſſe of Bedford : and to the right *worſhipfull and his verie good freends, ſir* CHARLES MORISINES knight, and the ladie DOROTHIE MORISINES his wife, T. W. *wisheth togither with all outvvard abundance of vvorldlie bleſſings the continuall comfort of a good conſcience heere, and the eternall ſaluation of their ſoules at the laſt through Chriſt.*

THe conſideration of the chriſtian fauors, which you (right honorable, right worſhipfull, & my verie deere freends) haue carried towards me, and the memorie of ſome benefits that I haue receiued from you, hath ſundrie times ſo affected my heart, that I could not, but in the good remembrance therof, in ſome meaſure of vnfeinedneſſe, as in reſpect of God, praiſe his holie name for thoſe his mercies, and as in regard of you, with earneſtneſſe pray vnto him, for your proſperous eſtates, and that in the beſt things eſpeciallie, and as in conſideration of my ſelfe, thinke vpon ſome good meane, wherby I might at the leaſt ſhew my ſelfe, in ſome ſort mindfull of, and thankefull for

the ſame. Whatſoeuer I write in this behalfe, I vtter it (I humblie thanke God for it) not vainegloriouſlie to boaſt, before God or men, in anie thing I haue done, for I know & feele in my ſelfe, that (ouer and beſides my groſſe & greeuous iniquities) euen in the beſt ſeruices that euer I performed in pietie towards God, or in charitie towards his people, there was by reaſon of mine owne corruption, and the imperfections that through the ſame did cleue thervnto, matter ſufficient inough, in truth to abaſe and to humble me indeed: neither yet as cunninglie to craue dailie and new kindneſſes (a vice too common in this corrupt age) the Lord hauing bin pleaſed in that behalfe, to beſtow vpon me more ſimplicitie, than by fawning flatterie to fetch from my freends, anie thing that might ſatisfie large affections, or releeue preſent want. But to theſe ends I proteſt, and that in ſingleneſſe of heart, haue I declared the ſame, namelie that all my chriſtian acquaintance, and amongſt others your honour and worſhips eſpeciallie might be aſſured, that the good you haue doone me, though at the firſt it might ſeeme to be caſt away, in as much as preſent teſtification of my gratefull minde were not then preſt and readie, hath not yet vtterlie beene loſt, becauſe now at the length God hath inabled me by ſome ſmall meanes to declare the contrarie: and againe, that I my ſelfe feeling my ſelfe now and then, by Gods grace I doubt not (for as I know, ſo I freelie confeſſe, that in my fleſh, that is to ſay, in my ſelfe, dwelleth nothing that is good) ſtirred vp to ſuch holie duties, might receiue, not in the things as performed by my ſelfe, but as they are graces of God, flowing from his goodneſſe, and wrought by his word and ſpirit, both ſome comfort in the daies of

my

my great greefe and heuineſſe of heart, and ſome incouragement to goodneſſe alſo, when mine owne dulneſſe and backwardneſſe to the ſame, not onelie ariſeth vp in me, but ſtandeth againſt it, as with force and might, to ſtop and hinder me therein. In regard whereof alſo, I doo at this time humblie offer and preſent vnto you (right honorable & right worſhipfull) togither, firſt a ſound diſcourſe or two, which that learned man M. Beza wrote, and I long ago tranſlated, and withall a ſhort ſumme, that I my ſelfe penned heeretofore, and haue inlarged againe all of them touching that great queſtion of the Lords ſupper. For that woorthie mans woorthie works, I dare proteſt and auer, that if the excellencie, either of the man, or matter, or maner, may purchaſe a frutefull commendation, and procure fauorable acceptation (with them that feare God I meane, & loue his truth ſincerelie) it ſhall not want either the one or the other. For as concerning the writer himſelfe, he is one of the woonders & woorthies of the world at this day, a man of rare parts euerie maner of way (whatſoeuer ſome, either of ignorance in themſelues, or pride of themſelues, barke out againſt him to the contrarie) whether we reſpect ſound knowledge and iudgement, in the toongs and trueth of God, or faithfull paines, and frutefull trauels in his miniſterie and place. And as for the worke, it concerneth a great ground of our chriſtian faith, and the ſame controuerted, not onlie betweene the ſuperſtitious papiſts and vs, in the queſtion of tranſubſtantiation, but with ſuch alſo as in the common profeſſion of Gods holie word and religion, we charitably take for our brethren, thogh otherwiſe in this point, ouerſhot as we ſay, & ouerſeene alſo. The maner of handling is deepe & pro-

found, and not ſhallow or meane, after the maner and dealing of other men, there being for the more full explication of the queſtion, deducted and laid out, ſundrie of the fundamentall points and principles of our chriſtian faith, and namelie touching the ſeuerall and diſtinct natures of God and man, and the perſonall vnion of them in our ſauiour Chriſt. But for mine owne I mind not to ſay much, ſpeciallie as in commendation therof. That which I thinke, I will plainelie expreſſe, and proteſt alſo, namelie that as nothing of mine, is in anie reſpect meet, to behold the light of this learned age, both by reaſon of mine owne wants & inſufficiencie, and alſo by means of the great ripeneſſe of knowledge and iudgement, that God hath ſhed abrode into the hearts of manie men: ſo I confeſſe my ſelfe & my writings, much more vnwoorthie, either the ſame day to be named with that woorthie man of the world, or anie maner of way to be ioined with his. And yet if the church approoue that which I doo, and the godlie receiue ſome profit by it to ſpirituall edification, I ſhall much reioice therin, not as in reſpect of that I haue doone (for I acknowledge my ſelfe to haue nothing ſaue that which I haue receiued) but as in regard of the good effects, that it hath through Gods almightie and ſecret bleſſing, brought foorth in the hearts of them, that haue bin or ſhalbe acquainted therewith: in which treatiſe, I haue ſpeciallie laboured two things. Firſt in the daies of ſo great blindneſſe and ignorance, amongſt the multitude and common ſort of people, as now preuaileth, to inſtruct the ſimple as much as I could in the ſound knowledge of theſe moſt holie myſteries, that ſo neither with the idle and vnskilfull conceits of their owne heads, nor with the ſuperſtiti-

ous and erronious opinions of other men concerning the ſame, caſt abrode into the world as baits to catch them, they might be deceiued, and carried away into vntruth, as if it were with a violent tempeſt & whirlwind. And ſecondlie, that in the midſt of ſo great and generall careleſneſſe, of fitting and preparing men for ſuch woorthie graces, as be exhibited and offered there (howſoeuer a common corruption that way, hath almoſt carried all away) I might at the leaſt, by reaching them my weake hand and feeble arme, if not altogither pull ſome out of that puddle, and ſo bring them to more comfortable and ſanctified vſe of theſe pledges of Gods grace, and their faith in the ſame, yet let them behold my loue and ſound affection for the effecting thereof to my vttermoſt. How I haue purſued theſe points, and atteined that I aimed at, let the godlie iudge, to whoſe good cenſures, I doo willinglie ſubmit my ſelfe, & all things that ſhall come from me praieng charitable conſtruction in that I haue doone, and brotherlie admonition if anie thing I haue failed. How it ſhall preuaile, either with manie or anie I know not: the gratious iſſue and bleſſing thereof I leaue to the Lord, who if our ſinnes hinder not, ſtanding betweene him & vs, as a huge and high wall, can and will no doubt make it effectuall in the minds of manie, to their ſpirituall good. But if your honor (good madame) and you (right worſhipfull and my verie good freends) togither with them that depend vpon you, and belong vnto you, may reape chriſtian inſtruction, and holy comfort thereby, and hauing faith & a good conſcience in all things, may by this and other holie meanes gratiouſlie grow, and mightilie continue, with the increaces of God, euen vnto the fruition of eternall

life

life at the laſt through Chriſt, I ſhall haue that, which I greatlie wiſh & deſire, and ſhall thinke my poore paines well ſatisfied & anſwered, in the good that ſhall light vpon them, whom I doo (as dutie alſo requireth) vnfeinedlie both reuerence and loue in Ieſus Chriſt. Thus humblie praieng pardon of my boldneſſe for this dedication, and earneſtlie crauing acceptation of my ſimple trauels, according to that accuſtomed courteſie that you are woont to ſhew to them, that come to throud themſelues vnder you, I doo in the moſt dutifull maner that I may or can for this preſent time end.

At London the ſixt of this Februarie:
1587.

Your honors and vvorships alvvaies dutifull and bounden in Chriſt Ieſus T.W.
the Lordes vnvvoorthie ſeruant.

THE FIRST HOMILIE,

made the seuenth daie of Aprill, in the yeere 1574.

BEing about to speake of the Lords supper, will begin with the words of our sauior out of the seuenteenth chapter of the gospell after Iohn. This is (saith the Lord Iesus) life euerlasting, that they know thee to be the onelie true & verie God, and him whom thou hast sent Iesus Christ. Iohn.17.3.

Two things principally to be obserued in the text.

Out of these words therefore we vnderstand or gather two things: The first is, that our saluation hangeth vpon the certeine knowledge of the true and very God, who is also the one and onelie God. The other is, that this knowledge was for our saluation at the last made manifest vnto vs, in the person of his sonne, so that he that perceiueth somewhat of God, or knoweth him without Christ, perceiueth or knoweth nothing at all to saluation. Wherevpon also this necessarilie followeth, that if we once perceiue the person & office of Christ (for these two things must be ioined togither) we doo withall vnderstand the true and

1

2

The knowledge of God without Christ, is nothing to saluation.

onelie way of eternall life.

And forasmuch as the controuersie touching the Lords supper must be directed to this end or marke, this must also be confessed, that the controuersies sprong vp & arisen touching these points cannot be taken away or ended, neither can we vnderstand or perceiue what we should truelie & rightly determine concerning the lords supper, except we begin with these things which must needs be knowne, touching Iesus Christ. Therefore before we come to intreat of the matter it selfe, that is to say, of the supper of the Lord, we wil shew what we ought by the word of GOD to beleeue concerning Christ. Certeinelie the thing it selfe will declare, that that foundation or groundworke being once laid, it will come to passe, that manie errors will of their owne accord, without anie other helpe, fall downe togither and vanish away: for it is certeine and manifest, that manie questions tossed to & fro, and handled touching this point, haue sprong from hence, because that some, which do so stiflie defend this their opinions, either haue not vnderstood, or els dissembled, what we ought to iudge and beleeue

Sound knowledge of Christes person and offices, will ouerthrow manie heresies.

Ignorance and hypocrisie, two great meanes to mainteine error.

leeue touching Christ. Wherefore some points being first put downe, we will afterwards by this rule examine diuerse, yea, repugnant & contrarie opinions touching the Lords supper, and will affirme such as are agreeable to these stedfast and vnmooueable principles, to be true, and such others as shall swarue from them, to be false.

In Christ we haue, I say, speciallie to consider two things: his person, and his office. By the word person we vnderstand or meane Christ himselfe. And his office we call that duetie or charge which the father laid vpon him, to saue vs, which thing he himselfe did most perfectlie and plentifullie performe. Now in the first place we must speake of Christes person, which we must of necessitie determine to be such a one, that he was fullie and throughlie able to indure and fulfill that duetie: for vnlesse it be certeine that Christ was such a one, as was able to accomplish all things necessarie, meet and apperteining to his charge, we shall in vaine reason or dispute concerning his office. In Christ therefore there are to be considered these two things, to wit, the

Two thinges cheeflie to be considered in Christ.

1 His person: of which he speaketh in this homilie.

2 His office: of which he speaketh in the next homilie.

In Christes person two things,

1 The whole person it selfe.

2 The two natures wherof it consisteth.

First he sheweth what we must vnderstand by natures in Christ.

natures whereof he consisteth, and the verie person it selfe, compacted as a man would say, of these natures. By the natures we vnderstand not naturall power as when we saie, this is the nature of a man, of a beast, of a plant, of this or that thing, neither formall power (for so they should be two persons, of which Christ should consist) but these two substances wherof Christs person consisteth, & is as it were compacted. As for example, if we say that man is made of two natures, the one spirituall, which is the nature of the soule, the other bodilie, which is the nature of the body: so we also say and affirme, that Christ consisteth of two natures, of which one is the Godhead, and the other is the manhood.

A similitude.

Eutyches affirmed, that Christ had but one nature, that is to say, diuine or of God, like as hee was but one person. Hee was about the yeere 450, as some think. His error was condemned in the Ephesine councell.

Nestorius deemed our sauior to be God. Hee was as some suppose, about the yeere 419.

By the way I will speake this thing, that we are constreined to vse new speeches, that we may auoid new errors, or els old ones new polished and trimmed, with which manie men at this daie do intangle & snare themselues: for, as in proper place hereafter we will shew, there haue risen & sprong vp within our remembrance certeine men, who renewing partlie the error of Eutyches, & partlie of Nestorius, haue

in

in stead of the word Godhead, brought in diuinitie, and therfore we are inforced to distinguish Godhead from diuinitie. And verilie Paule spake not rashlie where hee saith that the fulnes of the godhead dwelleth in Christ, where he vseth also, not the word θειότης, that is diuinitie, but θεότης, that is deitie or Godhead: for the Grecians, I know not by what meane, do much better and more effectuallie expresse these things than the Latins doo, as also in this argument, or matter, I would more gladlie & willingly for plainnesse sake say and vse ἀνθρωπότης, that is hominitas, if it be lawfull to speake so in Latine, or as you would say, mans nature, or the verie state and condition of mans nature, rather than humanitie or manhood.

Coloss. 2. 9.

The Gretians do in their termes more fitlie expresse religion than the Latinists.

Then we perceiue & vnderstand, that in Christes person, there are two substances, to wit, the Godhead and the manhood, as we say. So speaketh Athanasius in that famous confession of his, saieng that he was consubstantiall, that is, of the selfe same substance with the father, and as he himselfe expoundeth it, God of the substance of the father, and man of the substance of his mother, that is, of the same

Athanasius.

substance that we are. Afterwards the church vsed the word φύσις, that is nature. We confesse, saith the Chalcedon synod, that the sonne consisteth of two natures. Neither in deed was the terme nature vnaduisedlie vsed, or rashlie taken vp, albeit if we would narrowlie consider the propertie of the word, the word φύσις, that is nature, dooth not agree to the diuinitie, for it is deriued or commeth παρὰ τὸ φύεσθαι, that is, to be borne or sprong vp, which agreeth well to a thing created, but not to God himselfe, the creator. Wherefore this seemeth to be the reason, which led and mooued the fathers to vse this word, because they reasoned and disputed against Eutyches, by whome not onelie the verie natures themselues, but also the proprieties of the natures were confounded and shuffled togither. Now because Eutyches did mainteine and defend both these errors, and the word φύσις, dooth beside the substance comprehend and set out the propreties also, by which proprieties, that nature is defined, and made to differ from others, therefore it seemeth that the fathers vsed the word nature. In summe, let vs resolue vpon this, and set it downe

Synodus Chalcedonensis.

The reasons mooving the fathers to vse the word, Nature.

as an vndoubted truth, that when we say, Christ consisteth of two natures, we mean his deitie and humanitie, that is his Godhead, and mans nature.

Let vs now come to the word Person. The later writers haue called that person, which the former called ὑπόστασις. and the Latine writers haue retained and kept in vse this word person. Now amongst diuines, and in their writings οὐσία that is substance, and ὑπόστασις, that is person, are distinguished after this sort: vnder the word ὑπόστασι; or ὑποστάσεις in the plurall number, are meant the persons which are in the cõmon essence or being, hauing the proprietie ioined thereunto, whereby one ὑπόστασις a person is separated or distinguished from the other, and by the word οὐσία, that is substance, God or the Godhead it selfe is signified and meant, but the Father, the sonne, and the Holie spirit, are called ὑποστάσεις, that is persons. Neither was it rashlie or vnaduisedlie doone, that the church hath vsed the name of person, which Boêtius hath defined thus, saieng that it is ỹ communicate propertie of a reasonable substãce, because many did throgh very great

Touching the terme person.

Substance and person distinguished.

Boetius.

erroꝛ, freelie & indifferentlie vſe theſe two woꝛds ὑπόϛασις, that is perſon, & οὐσία, foꝛ one and the ſelfe ſame thing. So the Latine wꝛiters foꝛ ὑπόϛασις oꝛ perſon, vſed and ſaid ſubſtance, euen as the logitians are woont ſo to call it: wheꝛfoꝛe that this doubtfulneſſe might be auoided, the woꝛd πϱοσώπον began to be vſed.

Now let vs ſpeake moꝛe plainlie what we call perſon, oꝛ meane by that name, when we intreat of Chꝛiſt, whether that, which is as it were compounded, of the Godhead taking, and of the fleſh taken, ſo that, if it might be lawfull foꝛ vs to diuide Chꝛiſt into his parts, one part of his perſon ſhould be his Godhead, and the other part his manhood? Not ſo at anie hand, foꝛ Chꝛiſt is not ſaid oꝛ called a perſon pꝛoperlie in reſpect of his humanitie oꝛ manhood, but of his diuine nature onelie, and yet that not to be ſeparated from his manhood. This is the cauſe oꝛ reaſon thereof: If Chꝛiſtes humane nature had beene, beſoꝛe it was taken of the diuine nature: that is to ſay, of the woꝛd, there ſhould then be an vnion of two perſons, and not of two natures, and theꝛfoꝛe Chꝛiſt ſhould be a perſon compact of two perſons, wheꝛ-

Chriſtes manhood cannot properlie be called a perſon, and the cauſe therof.

vpon

vpon would insue manie absurd, vnprofitable, yea altogither wicked & vngodlie matters, whereof nowe there is neyther time nor place to speake. Therefore thus it must be determined, that the diuine nature tooke on it the humane nature, forming and fashioning it: and euen whiles it was formed and fashioned, to haue taken it vnto it selfe, that is to saie, that Christes humane nature was neuer extant, or had beeing, but in the Godhead: wherfore the humane nature in Christ, is not a person, but the humanitie subsisteth, and hath his being in this person of the word, and therfore Christ is not either in imagination or in deede, a double person, but one person consisting of two natures. For the word is both a nature & a person, but the manhood is not of it selfe, anie other thing than a nature, which (as they speake in the scholes) is become a person, and is vpholden in the godhead taking it vnto it selfe, so that now there are not two sonnes, to wit, one eternall and naturall, or of the substance and being of the father, and another created and adopted, but that onelie eternall sonne of GOD, sustaining and vpholding the nature vnited to himselfe

Christ as hee is God, is a person, & his godhead is a nature, as also his manhood.

There is but one sonne of God, as there is but one Christ.

selfe, so that also there are not two Christs, but one onelie, God and man together, from the time that he knitte or united to himselfe the nature which he tooke. Now we learne what we may call the person of Christ, to wit, the son of God manifested in the flesh.

What the person of Christ is.

Let vs come nowe to the word vnion: for vniting is that whereby these two natures, to wit, the godhead or the person of the word, and the humanitie or manhood are coupled together. The Grecians call this ἕνωσις, that is, the coupling or ioyning together of two thinges or more, in such sort, that of those many things commyng together, some one certaine thing is compounded or made. And there are diuers kinds of vnitings: for sometimes nature is vnited with the forme or shape: sometime an accident with the subiect: & sometime parts are vnited and knit vnto parts, to establish or make a whole matter. Wherefore vniting is one thing, and vnitie or oneneſſe (as a man might saye) is an other thing. For one or oneneſſe is not a number, neither dooth it necessarily presuppose a number, except in things compounded, but is the beginning of a

What vnion or vniting is.

There are diuers sorts of vniting.
1
2
3

Vniting, and vnion, or vnitie differ much.

number. Therefore we hold, that there is in Christ, a vnitie or oneneſſe indeede of the perſon, and an vniting of the natures.

These words are diligently to be marked, & ſo much the more, becauſe ỹ neglect thereof bringeth forth great confuſions & troubles in theſe diſputations & matters. Certainely, ἕνωσις, that is, vniting, and ἑνότης, that is, vnitie, or oneneſſe, are altogither diuers matters. For in the myſterie of the Trinitie, there is vnitie or oneneſſe of the eſſence, and a Trinitie in the perſons. Againe, on the other ſide, there is in Chriſt an vniting of the natures, and an vnitie or oneneſſe of the perſon. Wherefore the Fathers ſaide well, that in the diuinitie, there is not an other thing, and an other thing, that is to ſay, two thinges (for in the diuinitie there is but one onely and moſt ſimple eſſence or being) but an other and an other meaning perſons. For the Father is one, an other is the Son, and the Holie-ghoſt is an other. The reaſon is, becauſe when we ſay another, we mean the perſon: when wee ſaye an other thing, wee meane the nature. Wherefore there is not an other

In the godhead there is but one ſimple being.

thing

thing in the diuinity, for so there should be multiplication or multitude of Gods. In Christ on the other side, there is an other thing, and an other thing (because the godhead is an other thing than the manhood) and not an other, and an other, bicause Christ is but one subsistence or being, consisting not of two persons, but of mans nature being taken, which hath his subsisting and being in the diuine nature.

In Christ there is two natures, but not two persons.

Let vs nowe come to a more full and large declaration of the word vnion, or vniting. This kinde and maner of vnion or vniting, is called personall: vppon the true definition of which personall vnion dependeth the confutation of most great errors, wherewith too manie at this present are sicke and infected, as we shall wel perceiue, when we shall come to the matter it selfe: wherefore wee must describe the personall vnion out of the verie worde of God. First Isaiah saieth, that this our sauiour is Immanuell, that is, God with vs. Iohn expounding the fulfilling of this prophecie, saith, that the word became, or was made flesh. Nowe because a thing may be said to be made manie waies, that manner of being made is declared by the

Errors cannot be wel confuted, til the personall vnion bee well knowne.

Isaiah.7.14. Matth.1.23.

Iohn.1.14.

Apostle

Apostle, in the epistle to the Hebrewes, when hee saith, that the sonne tooke the seed of Abraham. Therefore the word taking, openeth and declareth this saieng of John: And the word was made flesh, and both these laid togither doo also declare, how Christ is God with vs: and all these things laid or ioined togither doo shew and determine what the personall vnion is. They which haue not interpreted that place of John, out of the place in the epistle to the Hebrues, haue fallen into diuerse errors: for some haue expounded it thus, the word was made flesh, because the word was in sted of the soule vnto the bodie taken, that is to say, that as the soule ioined with the bodie shapeth or fashioneth the man: so the person of the sonne tooke vnto it that bodie, that by that meanes he might become Christ. So that they depriued Christ of a humane soule, & in the sted thereof did substitute the Godhead. But beside that this opinion of Apollinaris is by almost infinit plaine testimonies of scripture refuted, this also necessarilie foloweth, that except the word had taken the soule vnto it,

Hebr. 2. 16.

Three errors by misinterpreting the words of Iohn.

1

Apollinaris taught that the sonne of God tooke onelie the bodie of a man, and not a reasonable soule. Tripartit. hist. lib. 5. cap. 44. & lib. 9. cap. 3. Basil. epist. 74. August. lib. & Hier lib. 9. He was about the yeere 380.

likewise

likewise our soules should of necessitie be
lost, because that onlie shal be saued which
Christ rested in his own person, neither
could Christ properlie haue suffered (that
I may let slippe many other most absurd
points) seeing that the soule properlie is
2 troubled and afflicted. Others haue
framed and deuised for true flesh, a ghost
or fantasie, and to that purpose haue wre-
sted and writhen the worde similitude or
Roman.8.3. likenes, in these wordes of Paule, God
sending his own son in the similitude of
sinful flesh, &c: whom the old fathers cal-
led δοκητας δοκητας.
They had a double name, Docitæ, or Doeetæ, and sprung indeede (as some suppose) from Simon Magus, who helde, that Christ came not in the flesh, but that hee was Christ. They held as the Marcionites did, that Christ suffered in a fantasie or ghost: See homil. 2. following.
If these mens opiniõs
were true, christ shold
not be in verie deede
Jesus, or a Sauiour,
as indeed one that had not bin borne or had
3 suffered for vs. There are othersome, who
forsaking these errors, do notwithstãding
fall into others, no lesse absurde and dete-
stable, because (as the Poet saieth) while
fooles auoid some vices or faults, they run
Nestorius, whose heresie what it was, is opened before.
into others. For Nestorius interpreted
these wordes, the word became flesh after
this manner, that is to saie, the godhead of
the Sonne of God did most plentifullie

and

and fullie powre foorth, the power and force therof into that flesh which it tooke. Which interpretation if it be true, Christ is not God, but diuine, or as you woulde say, god-like or heauenlie, and though he be the most excellent amongest saints and holie ones, yet hee is not to be worshipped, neither to be accounted as a Sauiour.

The absurditie of the former interpretation.

Whereas notwithstanding Paule attributeth vnto Christ, not the fulnesse of the diuinitie, but the fulnesse of the deitie or godhead, and to be both GOD and man (which is a proper title to our sauiour Christ) is far different from this, to be one that beareth or carrieth God. So that Nestorius maketh Christ God, not by the vnion of the very hypostasis or person of the word, but accounts him as most diuine, onely by the presence, comming, & force, or by the effusion or spreding abrode of gifts: and beside that, loosing, or destroying Christs person, he maketh him a mere or only man, he placeth also the person in his flesh a manhood: whereas on the other side, the flesh taken is sustained and vpholden in, and by, the godhead taking it.

Coloss. 2. 9.

Eutyches falling into the contrarie erroz,

Eutyches heresie confuted.

Three most grosse errors flowing from Eutyches his heresie.

error thought that by these words, the word was made or became flesh, this was meant that the person or hypostasis of the word was changed into flesh, and for the vniting of the natures, he substituted or established the abolishing of the Godhead, that is to say, darknesse for light: in which matter he was most foulie deceiued, for beside that the Godhead is vnchangable, it would follow, if that were true which Eutyches affirmeth, that the word ceased to be God, so soone as it was made or became flesh, because that that which was changed ceased to be that which it was: as when Moses rod was changed into a serpent it ceased to be a rod, and began to be a serpent, euen as Aristotle teacheth, that by the depriuing or taking away of one forme, another is brought in. But if the abolishing or taking away be denied, that a mingling a mixture may be established, whether it be of the natures themselues, it is of the Godhead and the manhood, or of the properties of either nature, then will insue that, which is more absurd than the former, to wit, that Christ is neither God nor man, but a certeine third thing compacted of both, as the drinke

1

2

Exod. 4. 2.

Aristotle.

3

drinke called Pulsum, made of wine and honie sodden together, is neither wine nor honie alone, but a certaine matter compounded or made of them both: and what can be imagined more woonderfull and monstrous than these errors? But all these errours, are both most shortlie and also most soundlie confuted, if the worde of assuming or taking, bee rightlie expounded: that is, by the comparing or conferring of other places of the Scripture. Wherefore declare at the length will some saie, what is the hypostaticall or personall union in Christ? It is the taking of mans nature, which is sustained or vpholden of the diuine nature, that is to say, such a taking or vniting, that there proceedeth or commeth out of that vniting, but one subsistence or being onelie, in which subsistence, that diuine nature, that is to saie, the person of the worde beareth swaie, or ruleth. I repeate this againe: The hypostaticall or personall union is that, from which rebounded or proceedeth our hypostasies or person: for the more plaine manifesting and declaring whereof the fathers haue vsed the similitude of the bodie and the

The right interpretation of some words profitable to confute sundrie errours.

The personall vnion what it is.

Athanasius. soule, Athanasius, who was a most constant defender and stout maintainer of this truth, being chiefly the author thereof. Wherefore as a certaine soule, beeing ioyned to a certain bodie, maketh one certaine person, as Peter, Paule, John. So that eternall worde of the Father, tooke vnto it that flesh of the virgine, that is to saye, made the same so proper vnto it selfe, that from hence commeth and proceedeth that person, whiche is called Christ. It appeareth plainelie vnto vs, out of the wordes of Christ in the tenth chapiter of the gospel according to John, that we must needes consider this mystery or secret after this sort. Christ there saith, I haue power to lay downe my soule or life, and to take it againe. For necessary is it that Christ shoulde so speake, either secretlie in respect of his bodie, or in respect of his soule, or else in respect of his bodie and soule together, or else distinctly and plainely in respect of his godhead. Christ coulde not so saye in respect of the bodie considered by it selfe, because the body is not said to laie downe a soule or to take it againe, because so excellent an action cannot be attributed to an instrumēt

A similitude.

Iohn.10.18.

The place of Iohn 10. expounded: which cannot be vnderstood either of the

Bodie alone

that

that which is rather subiect to the soule. or Soule alone
But is it in respect of the soule it self considered by it selfe? No indeede: for then Christ shoulde rather haue saide: I haue power to lay downe my selfe a soule, and to take vp againe my selfe a soule. Verily in the resurrection, the soule is not taken vp againe, but the bodie: therefore these words cannot be ascribed to Christ, either in respect of his bodie onelie, or in respect of his soule onely: What then is it in re- or of them both togither,
spect of them both together? No, rather necessarie is it that wee referre it to some third thing, which may be saide to laie downe, and to take vp his soule. Therefore Christ so spake according to his dei- but of the godhead.
tie: and when hee saieth, that he hath power to laie downe his life, and to take it againe, he dooth againe open that mysterie or secret which wee handle. For the verie natures indeede so ioyned together, are in suche sorte sette out, that not two things, but one alone is established, and that without confusion, yet so that the one nature beareth rule. And it is meete to be marked that Christ saieth: I haue power to laie downe, not euery soule, but mine owne. Therefore this cannot so be

taken, nor referred to this end, that God should be the lord of all being things, but he sheweth, that that soule of his which he would lay down & take again, was otherwise his soule, than other mens soules are theirs. How then is it Christes soule will some men say? Verily by personall vnion.

Iohn.4.12. The scripture saith that God dwelleth in vs, and yet we beleeue and confes, that he dwelleth not in his saints, by his vnion or

1.Corinth.6.19. vniting: For our bodies are so the tẽples of the holy ghost, that yet they make not one subsistẽce or being with the holy ghost sith that the sanctified party is seuerally & by himselfe a certaine thing, & so likewise the holy ghost, to wit, god eternall. So a wicked spirit, and some one possessed with ỹ same wicked spirit, are ioined together, & yet the vncleane spirite is not in man, as the soule is in the bodie. For the wicked spirit remaineth by it self, a certain thing much like as the ghest is in his inne: and againe, the possessed with the wicked spirit, is so become the inne or lodging place of the wicked spirite, that yet the ghest is another from him. As for vs we affirme, the person of the word, or son of God so to dwell in that manhood that he hath taken

vnto

vnto him, that hee hath vnited himselfe thereto by a personall vnion: so I say, that the nature taken or assumed, being sustained and vpheld in the nature taking or assuming, maketh yet notwithstanding but one person, which is the eternall worde of God. Hereupon it foloweth that there are not two sonnes of God, much lesse two Christs, one, the son of Marie, the other, the son of God, but one Immanuel and saviour onelie. And this is the very true description of the personall vnion, as wil yet much more plainelie appeare, if we compare with this truth touching the personal vnion: the descriptions that are partlie felt from the olde heresies, and partlie anew deuised by the fresh furbushing of the aforesaid heresies. First, there are some that feare not openly to say, that the habitation or dwelling of God in Christ, is not otherwise to be considered in Christ, or that he doth no otherwise dwell in him, than in other men, yea than in other creatures. Iacobus Andreas in those his Thesis or propositions, by which he blowed to the field, or bade the battel, wrote the same euen in so many words, as you would saie, to wit, that the habitation or dwelling of

Matth. 1.21.23

Sundrie sorts of errors.

Iacobus Andreas assertion, and the same confuted.

the son of God in Christ is not otherwise to be considered than in all other creatures whatsoeuer, as in respect of his essentiall habitation or dwelling, for God is euerie where. If a man demaund what shall be the difference of the personall vnion: this shall be their answeare, that it consisteth herein, that into all other things the godhead hath powred forth some properties or qualities, but into Christes humanity or manhoode hee hath powred all properties. A wonderfull thing; that after that these opinions haue nowe a long while since bin tossed, and by the solemne and most iust iudgements of Christes church, condemned and confounded by so many darts, as haue come from heauen it selfe, against the authors and fautors of these vngodlie blasphemies, a maruellous thing, I say, that there should now spring vp some, as dare be bolde, both by worde and writing, to maintaine and defend the same, and that with so great reioicing and commendation of most vnskilfull men: for who is he vnles hee be altogither blinde, that seeth not, that if the word be no otherwise present in christ, thã in many things, (that is to say, beingly, presently, power-

as

fully as in schools they were woont to say) that then Christs person is destroied, as Nestorius taught? And that if wee grant an effusion or powring forth of all the properties of the godhead into the flesh assumed or taken, that then the other part of the vngodlie assertion of Eutyches, shall be erected and set vp? A wonderful wound indeed flowing from such diuers matters, to wit, the seperating of the natures on the one side, & the effusion or powring forth of the properties of the one nature into the other, on the other side, & first in our memory & time most impudently fried, and most vnskilfully by our vbiquitaries defended.

His heresie is declared before.

Concerning him and his heresie, see before.

But let vs, I pray you, somwhat more narrowlie looke into the matter, that we may see what it meaneth. This I say, that if the personall vnion be to be defined and determinedby the effusion or powring forth of all properties, that then this, which of al things is most false & vngodly will follow therevpon, to wit, that God is in some sorte personallie vnited vnto all things created. Why so? Because the effusiō or powring forth of all, & some properties alone, doo not differ *genere*, as they say, that is, in the general or cōmon kind,

Hee ouerthroweth the error by absurdities insuming vpon it. The first absurditie.

but according to more or lesse only: wherfore either Christ was not otherwise God than any other thing, though perhaps hee were somewhat more perfect than other things, or else other things were diuine and god-like, but Christs flesh most diuine and god-like. Againe, if the definition of the personall vnion were true, it woulde followe therevpon, that the three persons wer vnited, to that flesh that was assumed or taken, for the essentiall proprietie of the verie godhead it selfe, are common to the three persons in one & the self-same essence or being: therfore to be infinite, almighty, knowing al things, present euery wher &c: (as they themselues now speak) be not proprieties, either of the father or of the son, or of the holy ghost, but onely of that alone, and altogither singular godhead. Wherevpon it foloweth, that if we grant that definition of the personall vnion, that then the 3 persons of the godhead were incarnat, & tooke flesh vpon them, and so we shall proceede further than the patropassian heretiks. Moreouer, by this means the godhead it selfe shold be spoiled of his most essential proprieties, euē this I say which are most proper therto, or which do belōg vnto

The second absurditie.

They were so called, bicause they affirmed that God the father suffered. Isiodor. Orig. libr. 8.

The third absurditie.

vnto the same, after the fourth maner or sort, as the logicians speake, that is to say, doo belong vnto the whole Godhead alone vnto the Godhead, and alwaies vnto the same: for verilie, if they be in deed communicated vnto the nature of man that was assured or taken, then I say they doo now cease to be proper to the Godhead, vnlesse we minde to make these termes, proper & common, all one. But the Lord speaketh otherwise in the prophet sateng: I will not giue my glorie vnto another. Isaiah.48.11.

What more? Him whome these men in the first part of their Nestorian opinion, had made of him that was God & man togither in one person, but one that carried or bare God, these now in another part of their Eutychian opinion & conceit, transforme him I say and his flesh (hauing in deed all the properties of the Godhead without exception powred into the same) into the Godhead it selfe. But now, if there nothing happen to God, or there be no accident in him, as indeed there is not, for whatsoeuer is in him, is substance and not accidents, as they speake in schooles, How were the properties (by which he is distinguished from things created) indeed The fourth absurditie.

powred forth into the flesh assumed and taken, but that also mans nature should be changed into a certeine Godhead that is made or created: But if these men will denie (as sometimes I see them by the power of trueth it selfe constreined to denie) that the monstrous presence euerie where (for whose cause onelie (whatsoeuer they faine) they propound vnto vs that monster of vbiquitie, to be esteemed and reuerenced) dooth not cleaue vnto Christes flesh as to his proper subiect, or that it is not accidents, but onlie as accidents, then I say, who seeth not what monstrous things these are, to ascribe vnto the flesh a reall presence euerie where in it selfe, though not of it selfe, the subiect whereof should yet notwithstanding, not be the flesh it selfe, but the Godhead, which Godhead for all that, should no otherwise be present to the flesh, than to all other things whatsoeuer? And whereof will these men be ashamed, who are so farre off from being ashamed of these matters, that yet they dare obiect this against vs, that we exact points of diuinitie and religion to be handled according to the rules of philosophie? Certeinelie, if so be it that

He procureth an obiection.

The fift absurditie.

the

the personall vnion must be defined and determined, not by the vnion of the verie person of the word, with flesh assumed or taken, into one and the selfe same subsistence or being, yet without anie reall vnion, either of the natures themselues or of the essentiall properties wherwith they are indued, but by the vniuersall effusion or powring foorth of powerfull graces from the nature assuming or taking, into the nature assumed or taken (which monstrous opinion fet from the filthie & stinking puddles, both of Nestorius & Eutyches also, and twise sod Brentius, Suindelinus, Illyrichus, and these other goodlie fellowes doo propound and deliuer vnto the churches of Christ) I say that whether they will yea or no, this must needs follow vpon it, that Christ is neither God nor man, much lesse GOD and man togither, but a certeine Chimæra or monster made of most grosse confusion and discord. Yea, and what meaneth this, that they themselues are of necessitie constreined to except some things, after that they haue affirmed that all things are powred foorth. For these things verilie to be without beginning to be of himselfe

Chimæra is a monster hauing three heads, one like a lion, another like a gote, & the third like a dragon.

The first absurditie.

selfe, &c. Cannot be attributed to a creature, but they may be personallie united, and are in deed personallie united, because that must be true which Christ himselfe saith: Before Abraham was, I am. And this is true, because that he that after so manie ages passed from the beginning of the world was made, or became the sonne of Mary, euen he I say, is that word which was in the beginning, not so much for his full effusion or powring foorth of powerfull graces, as for the bodilie vnion or vniting of the Godhead it himselfe in the person of the word: wherefore, if we will beleeue these men, this sonne of the virgine Marie shall not be eternall, because there was not powred into the flesh assumed or taken, that same being without beginning, whereof he cannot be partaker, euen as they themselues confesse, who are otherwise large shedders abroad, or rather euerters and ouerthrowers of all properties. They being thus driuen from hense, euen as it were out of some hold or fortresse of their owne, at the last they retire hither, or haue this starting hole, to say forsooth, that the personall vnion consisteth heerin, that the word dooth nothing, but with the manhood

Iohn. 8. 58.

Iohn. 1. 1.

Another obiection answered or rather error confuted.

manhoood and by the manhood, as the soule dooth nothing, but with the bodie or by the bodie. I will leaue this to the Peripatetians to be reasons of, whether it be true, that the soule ioined to the bodie doth nothing of it selfe, for there are not diuers wanting, that doo stiflie and stoutlie denie the same. But I affirme, that that definition of the personall vnion, cannot stand. I grant therefore, that from the time the eternall word tooke flesh vnto him, that it did not at anie time doo anie thing without the flesh, the reason is, because this vnion is perpetuall: and yet for al that, it dooth not heerevpon follow, that whatsoeuer the worde did, he did it by the flesh. Though it be granted, I say, that the word did nothing being separated from the flesh, because that that flesh which it once tooke it neuer laid downe, yet it followeth not, that whatsoeuer the word did, it did it by the flesh, which thing may bee shewed, by most assured and manifest examples. Christ raised vppe himselfe by his owne diuine power, who also had said of himselfe: I haue power to lay downe my soule or life, and to take it againe. Did therefore the Godhead, through the flesh accom-

Peripatetians were subtle philosophers of Aristotles sect & opinion, who had their names of disputing walking.

The first example.

Iohn. 10. 18.

accomplish and perfoꝛme that woꝛke? I suppose no man will say so. When Christ beheld Nathaniell absent, did he see him with his bodilie eies? And when without the disclosing of anie other man, he saw the thoughts of his aduersaries, did he this by anie sharpnesse of mans minde oꝛ vnderstanding? No verilie. Wherefoꝛe he saw all these things as he was God, and not with minde oꝛ bodie, and yet he saw them not without man, because he being God is man also. When he healed the Centurians seruant being absent, did he that as when he healed that blind man being pꝛesent, putting his hand to him, and making the claie? No in deed. Foꝛ he wꝛought this latter, by his hands mooued thꝛough the flesh, that is to say, vsing the instrument of flesh assumed oꝛ taken, whereas he healed the other by the onelie power of his Godhead. And yet he was not free from flesh. I confesse it. He healed him therefoꝛe with the flesh, but not thꝛough flesh. Wherefoꝛe in this fellow-woꝛking togither of the Godhead, & the nature assumed oꝛ taken, the personall vnion is not deposed oꝛ ouerthꝛowne, but established rather. Beside though I should grant

The second example. Iohn. 1.48. Matth. 9.4.

The third example. Matth. 8.13. Iohn. 9.6.7, &c.

grant the antecedent or first proposition, to witte, that the worde dooth nothing but with and by the manhood, yet that would not follow therevpon that they imagine. For though the artificer or handicrafts man doo nothing but by his instrument or toole, yet for all that the artificer and his toole are not vnited into one subsistence or being: this is my meaning, that that it dooth or worketh, is not therefore vnited with that, by which he dooth or worketh, for the dooer, and the instrument of doing are two seuerall and distinct things. So the smith or carpenter is not vnited with his hammer or mallet. The father created all things through the sonne, as the holie scripture witnesseth. Now because the father created all things through the sonne, shall it therevpon follow, that the father and the sonne are personallie vnited together? No verilie: For they are, and that in deed distinct persons, Wherfore neither in the effusion or powring out of powerfull graces, nor in the communicating of their powerfull working together, can the personall vnion be well described. Let that rather remaine sure, that I haue said, to wit, that that vnion

He granteth the aduersaries that which they speake, and yet they gaine nothing by it.

An apt similitude.

Iohn. 1. 3. Hebr. 1. 1.

Personall vnion, what it is.

vnion may rightlie be called personall, by which it commeth to passe, that one person of two natures (the natures & properties of either nature remaining safe & sound) becommeth one subsistence or being: of which two natures one, that is to say, the nature assumed or taken, hath his being in the assuming or taking nature, because if either of them did subsist or had it being of it selfe, they should be two persons. Moreouer, before we take in hand to handle the matter it selfe, we must also declare, how from this personall vnion insueth that which the old writers and fathers were woont to call communicating of the properties: for if both the natures themselues and the properties thereof doo remaine safe and sound, then there remaineth likewise vnto either nature these proper attributes or things ascribed vnto them: and therefore it should seeme, that it cannot be attributed to one nature, which is proper and peculiar to the other. And yet the scripture so speaketh, as when it saith that God suffered, yea and we our selues are taught so to speake, in the apostles symbole or creed, when we say: I beleeue in Iesus Christ, the onlie sonne of

Act. 20. 28.

God

God, who was conceiued, borne, suffered, crucified, buried, &c. That we may well know and vnderstand this matter, we must learne to distinguish the things attributed to either nature. If we will speake properlie and truelie, we say that things attributed to either of the natures, must most properlie and in deed be attributed to the same. And this is the first rule. Wherefore we affirme that Christ, as in respect of his Godhead, is the eternall sonne of God, is infinite, is euerie where, is eternall, is the creator of all things, cannot die, is inuisible, &c. All which things are truelie and properlie attributed to that nature of the son of God which is vnited to flesh. Now these things are proper to his humane nature or manhood, that it had a beginning, that it was conceiued by the Holie ghost, that it suffered, and at the last rose againe. Now from whence commeth this difference? Verilie from this, that the natures remaine safe, sound, and vnconfounded, least if in the personall vnion they were confounded, that which were spoken of ones nature should be attributed to the other. And the second rule is this, Certeine

Certeine rules are to be obserued for the right vnderstanding of the communicating of proprieties.

The first rule.

The second rule

thinges are attributed to, or spoken of Christ, according to his person and not as in respect of his natures, that is to say, such thinges in deede as respect the person, and are attributed to his said person, which cannot yet be spoken seuerallie of either of his natures: as for example, if I say Christ is the mediator: that word mediator, neither to the Godhed by it selfe nor to the manhood by it selfe, or apart from the Godhead, but to the whole person of Christ, for he is a mediator according to either nature: and these thinges attributed together to Christ, are personall, that is to say, respect his whole person, which vnlesse we confesse we shall fall into the heresie of Nestorius and his partakers. And yet in the meane while this & such like, are so the works of the whole person, that notwithstanding either of the natures doth distinctlie bring with it his proper & peculiar worke to this common deed of redemption, mediation, &c. as Leo teacheth in that his famous and woorthie epistle, which also we must know and beleeue, least we should fall into that other heresie of the Monothelits or Monophysits. And yet the knot is not vntied, nor

Leo. One sort of heretiks had both these names, because they held that Christ had but one will, & one nature, and not two wils, or two natures answering to his two natures.

the

the matter dispatched. Therefore we are principallie to marke yet a certeine other maner of speech touching Christ, which as it is true in respect of the whole person, denominated either of the concretes: so it cannot without great impietie be attributed to either of the natures, considered by themselues, or in the abstract: as for example, when we say, God (to wit, the word or sonne) redeemed the church by his blood: so we doo righteli beleeue and say, that God suffered and died, which that vngodlie man Nestorius denied. For vnlesse God had beene he that suffered for vs, his suffering could not haue brought saluation vnto vs. Wherefore we say that God was wine, suffered, dead, and rose againe. And againe on the other side we say, that the sonne of man was in heauen, when he spake on the earth with Nicodemus. And this we affirme euen by this rule following, to wit, that whatsoeuer words or termes, are proper to either of the natures, that is to say, the Godhead or the manhood, they may be changed in the concret, but not in the abstract. But some man will say, What is it that you call the abstract? We call the very forme

These darcke termes are expounded afterwards by the author himselfe.

Acts.20.28.

Iohn.3.13.

The third rule.

Abstract, and what he meaneth thereby.

it selfe, being by thought seuered from the matter, an abstract: as for example, If I doo in my mind comprehend, no some iust man or other, but some iustice or righteousnesse of a man: which alloweth place in other predications. Iustic therefore or righteousnesse shall be a creeine abstract, that is to say, a thing considered by it selfe, and not in the subiect, or particular partie wherein it is. And the concret shall be the matter or man himselfe, as a iust man, to wit, he that is indued with that iustice or righteousnes. So in Christ, we consider in the abstract two natures, the manhood and the Godhead, but in the concret we comprehend him God & man. Therefore let Godhead and manhood be the abstracts, and God and man the concrets. And then I say, that the thinges attributed to the humanitie may be attributed to God, or spoken of him, though they cannot be attributed to the Godhead, or spoken thereof: and on the other side I affirme, that such things as be proper to the Godhead may be attributed to man, though not to the manhood. Therefore this proposition is true: This man is God, or this: The eternall word of the

Concret, and what he meaneth therby.

father is man: but these are vngodlie and blasphemous: the Godhead is the manhood, or the manhood is the Godhead. So we must say and beleeue God, that is to say, the sonne was borne of the virgine, suffered, dead, &c. but not the Godhead: for he indeed that is God suffered, but not his Godhead. Therefore when Peter saith that Christ suffered, he added in the flesh. So Paule, *Rom.* 1. He was mightilie declared to be the son of God according to the spirit. The cause of this predication or speech in the abstract, is the verie personall vnion it selfe, to wit, because that that subsistence or being, or that person Christ, is by the figure Synecdoche so denominated of either of his natures. Wherefore, whether he be called man, he is yet notwithstanding vnderstood to be God, or whether he be called God, he is likewise vnderstood to be man. But when wee speake of the natures themselues, to wit, either the manhood or the Godhead, by these abstracted names ther is nothing els signified or meant but the seuerall natures in and by themselues. And least these maner of speeches might seeme to anie man darke and strange, as though christian re-

1. Pet. 3 18.

Rom. 1. 4.

That is a part put for the whole.

He preuenteth an obiection.

religion were conteined in certeine hidde mysteries and secrets far remooued from common vse & vnderstanding, whereas rather on the other side, the Holie ghost instructing the Church, touching these most darke & hidden matters, hath kept a most grosse (as you would say) and common maner of teaching. Theodoret both rightlie and trulie telleth vs, that euen the common people are hardlie accustomed to speake anie otherwise: for if Peter speake, who would not rather say that Peter speaketh, than say that Peters bodie or toong speaketh? and yet notwithstanding, neither booth Peters minde, nor his foot, nor anie other member speake, but his toong or mouth.

Theodoretus.

Two similitudes to explaine the point by.

But because these things haue euen personallie growne vp (as it were) together, and are come into one subsistence or being, that is truelie in the concret attributed to, and spoken of the whole, which if it were vttered of the parts of the whole considered seuerallie, and by themselues, should be fallie spoken. What more? By reason of this personall vnion, though now it be dissolued through death, Peter shalbe said to haue died and lai at Rome,

whole

whole soule yet notwithstanding, neither is dead, neither anie where placed vpon the earth. So when I say, the eternall sonne of God died, I consider and meane him as he is whole Christ, although I denominate him after one of his natures, to wit, his mortall or humane nature. So againe I say: This man forgiueth sinnes, and yet not as he is man of himselfe (for it belongeth onelie to God to forgiue sinnes) but because he is God and man in one person togither. Marke.2.7.

And this is the manner of speaking which the ancient diuines haue called the communicating of proprieties, which some do not rightlie distinguish from making common, and other some disputing whether it be reall yea or no, haue bewraied most grosse ignorance. And this may easilie be decided and determined by the vnmooueable foundations aboue said, if we haue not a contentious spirit, whereynto if we should not yeeld, doubtlesse the old sophisters and naturall philosophers, if they were aliue at this day, wold laugh vs to scorne. Diuinitie & christian religion admitteth no false matter or point: therefore that trope or maner of speech touching Communicating of proprieties, and what it is. Religion alloweth no falshood.

the communicating of the propꝛieties, is altogither true in the concret, that is in Chꝛists person, being weighed, as if some whole thing should be considered iointlie and togither, neither was it woont otherwise to be vsed in the church. But in the abstract, that is in the appellatiue oꝛ common name, oꝛ name whereby either of the natures be called, it can neuer be vsed without vngodlinesse, much lesse can it be taken foꝛ true, that the propꝛieties of the Godhead may be spoken of the manhood, oꝛ the propꝛieties of the manhood spoken of the Godhead. And these be the points, which we being about to speake of the Lords supper, haue thought needfull to be propounded and deliuered, that therefoꝛe remaining behind, may be the better vnderstood, of which we will, by Gods grace, speake at large in the next reading oꝛ lecture.

THE

THE SECOND HOMILIE,

or Sermon, made the eight of Aprill. 1574.

THis is the sum of the thinges that wee spake in the former Sermon, to wit, that 1 al the knowledge of our saluation, did depend of the knowlege of Christ: and that wee 2 had in Christ, principally two things to be considered, that is to saye, such as did concerne the knowledge of his person, and such also as did concerne the knowledge of his offices. We haue heard, 3 that vnder the name or worde of person, there was meant Christ himselfe: further, that that person consisted of two natures, that is, the godhead & the manhoode, both of these being so vnited and ioyned together, that the very natures themselues, & their properties also remaining sound and vnconfounded, Christ by that meanes is become, but one subsistence or being. For wee haue alreadie affirmed, the godhead so to haue assumed and taken the manhood vnto it, that they are not now two persons, but two natures: of which two natures, the one, that is to say, the nature assumed

The summe of the former Sermon, consisting of foure particular points.

1

2

3

or taken, is sustained and vpheld, or (as I may so say) made a perso, with the nature assuming, that is to say, the godhead: from 4 this wee proceeded, to speake of suche things, as were attributed to, or spoken of either of the natures, or the whole person: and wee affirmed, that they were so to be vsed, as that we alwaies preserued the vnion of the person, and continuallie auoided the confounding of the natures. For seeing these two natures, are as the Synode of Chalcedon saieth, vndiuidedlie, vnseparablie, and vnconfoundedlie coupled together in the personall vnion: necessarie is it, that either of these natures should haue their owne proper thinges attributed vnto them, and therfore not communicated vnto others. Wherfore some things attributed to the godhead, and some things also attributed vnto the manhood, were so proper and peculiar to the Godhead, and the manhoode, that those that were attributed to the one, coulde not be spoken of the other without great impietie and vngodlinesse. Notwithstanding, by reason of the personal vnion excepting alwaies that which is attributed to the whole person, and belongeth to both natures,

Synodus Chalcedonensis.

tures, as when Christ is called the mediator, and such like) such things as are proper to the godhead, and therefore as wee haue said can neuer be spoken of the manhoode) are yet notwithstanding attributed to Christ as man: and againe, suche things as are proper to man, are spoken, and that rightlie of God, but neuer, or at no hand of the godhead. The reason is, because that the subsistence or being is denominated euen in the concret of one of the natures onelie. So by the Sonne of GOD, wee doo many times vnderstand, not onely the godhead of the sonne by it selfe, but Christ manifested in the flesh. And by the GOD of glorie wee meane GOD become or made man: and likewise by sonne of man, we meane man assumed or taken of the eternall sonne of God. 1. Timoth. 3. 16.

Whereby it commeth to passe, that by reason of that personall vnion, some thinges in the concret, may bee saide of the whole person, which yet notwithstanding in the abstracte, doo agree to one of the natures onelie. So Saint Paule affyrmeth, that the GOD of glorie was crucified, which proposition 1. Corinth. 2. 8.

is

One and the selfe-same proposition true and vntrue in seuerall senses.

is not true touching whole Christ, that is to say, if wee regarde or consider Christ, as some whole matter, consisting of some particulars: but not true, if wee vnderstand it of all or euery thing belonging to Christ, that is to saye, if wee seuerally and distinctlye consider his seuerall natures; because the name of the GOD of glorie, dooth in the abstract agree or belong, to the onelie godhead. Wherefore this proposition is true in the sense as before, whereas otherwise it is a wicked and an vngodlie thing to say, that the godhead was crucified. Likewise in the creede of the Apostles, we say, that wee beleeue in Iesus Christ the onely Sonne of God, conceiued, borne, suffered, &c: all which are truely and christianly spoken. And why so? Because that by the name of the Sonne of God in the councell, we meane not God, the word, by himselfe alone, but GOD manifested in the flesh. So the Sonne of man talking with Nicodemus on earth was in heaueu: the reason is, because he that is man, is God also: and yet the manhoode of christ was at that time no where else, but on earth, euen as nowe also christs flesh being taken vp into

Symbol. Apost.

Iohn. 3. 13.

Acts 1. 11.

Matth. 28. 20.

heauen,

heauen, and therefore absent from vs, that Sonne of man, is yet notwithstanding present with vs, because the same christ is that true GOD, whome neither heauen nor earth can containe. Wherefore, as these propositions are false, the Godhead is the manhoode, or the manhoode is the godhead: so these are true: This man is God, and GOD, the worde, is man. Now then, if man be truely saide to be God, by reason of the personall vnion, it followeth thereuppon, that thinges attributed to the manhoode may rightlie be attributed to GOD: and on the other side, that things attributed to the Godhead may rightly be attributed to, or spoken of christ, man. But let vs now come to ỹ other part of the knowledge that concerneth our saluation, that is, to christes office. This office is declared in his name: for he is Iesus, that is to say, a Sauiour, because God the father hath therefore giuen him vnto vs, that hee might saue vs, to wit, from our sinnes. Now hee saueth vs, by iustifieng vs, because eternall life, doth of necessitie agree with iustice or righteousnes. Wherefore hee giueth vs life, in giuing vs righteousnesse, and

Isaiah 66.1. Actes 7.48.

Matth.1.21.

that

that of his meere and onely grace, through the power and effectuall working of his holie spirit: for euen that very selfe-same power of God, which laide it selfe open in the creation of man, must of necessity manifest it selfe also in restoring of man.

One and the selfe-same power of God, appeareth in mans creation and mans restitution, sauing that this latter, in my iudgement, and before men (though not before God) seeme to be the more excellent and hard worke.

This is it that I meane: as God the father did freelie through his sonne, together with his almightie power, which is the holie-ghost, create man: so the selfe-same god, doth by sauing iustifie, and by iustifieng saue man, through his owne sin fallen from grace, and yet made againe, or anewe, as it were, through his sonne, in the powerfull working of the holie spirit. For the holy-ghost worketh in vs that instrument which we cal faith, by which onely we lay hold of christ after that we know him. Neither is this faith some simple or bare accident, but a habit, as they call it in the schooles, truelie grafted in vs, not by nature, but by gods meere and free grace. But remember, I pray you, that by laying holde of Christ, I vnderstand the apprehension or taking holde euen of Christ himselfe. For wee must consider two things in Christ, that is to saie, hee himselfe, god and man, and such things

Two things principallie to be considered in Christ.

as

as bee in him. For example (though it may be I confes, that the similitude shall not agree in all points) if in a casket or boxe I set before a man, treasure, he that will haue the treasure hidden or shutte vp therein, must of necessitie take the casket or boxe it selfe: euen so there are in Christ, all those treasures of wisedome and vnderstanding: yea (and to speake all in fewe wordes) all those things, which are necessarily required to our saluation. Wherefore wee must of necessitie haue him, that so we may obtaine those things that are in him, and by the meanes of them eternall life. But tell vs, by what instrument wee doo take holde of him, as it were, by a certaine hand, that hee may wholie become ours, and wee his: Verilie by faith. Nowe the holie-ghost is hee, who going about to worke in vs, this excellent instrument of faith, vseth for that purpose, the preachyng of the outwarde worde, by which worde hee alone properlye worketh inuisiblye in vs.

A fit similitude. Colos. 2. 3. Roman. 10. 17.

But that we may the better vnderstand this point, lette vs a little compare this naturall instrument of Faith, to witte,

the

the outward worde with that supernaturall instrument, that is, the spirite.

Light of nature may somewhat helpe vs to obtaine naturall things, but it can nothing further vs in the vnderstanding and beleeuing of heuenly things.

The doctor or teacher by speaking, teacheth his scholers that which he speaketh. For speech is the instrument and meane, whereby we lay open the meaning of our mindes one of vs to an other, by vnderstanding whereof, they to whome wee speake, become skilfull in those thinges that wee speake: euen so it pleaseth God to vse his worde written and preached, that so hee might teach vs the knowledge of saluation, yet the way and order in both of these is maruellously diuers, if not altogether contrary. For whereas our minde by a certaine ingendred and natural power, is apt to conceiue & vnderstand worldlie things (yea, and though it be true, that some men are more apte to learne than othersome, yet all men generallie, are indued with faculte and power, to vnderstand those points, either by bookes, or the mouth of their teacher) when wee come to the true knowledge of God, and that his heuenlie secret touching our saluatiõ, God must of necessitie vse a far other power, in framing and disposing our minds, that so our eares beeing purged, and our harts

harts also, we may in our vnderstanding comprehend these matters, and hauing comprehended them approue of them, yea consent vnto them, and stay our selues vpon them, or else we shall neuer attaine thereto. And this is that same inuisible working power of the holie-ghost, which graueth into our heartes that which the minde perceiueth or vnderstandeth: otherwise the pastors and techers might speak to deafe people, as it doth by too too common examples appeare at this day. Therfore the Apostle saieth, that the gospell is an offense or stumbling blocke to the Iewes, and that it seemeth foolishnesse vnto the Gentiles. And in another place, that it is to some, the sauor of life vnto life, and to other-some, the sauor of death vnto death. But to whome is it the sauor of life vnto life? Euen vnto suche as so perceiue and receiue it, that they admit, and submit themselues thereto. And yet it can not be vnderstood and receiued, vnlesse the holie-ghost doo by his powerfull grace alter and change vs. Wherfore to them then it must bee the sauor of death vnto death that doo refuse it, and call it farre from them. Neither is God,

1. Corinth. 1. 23.

2. Corinth. 2. 16.

or the gospell it selfe, cause of this neglect or contempt, but the verye corrupt nature of man: for the naturall manne perceiueth not the thinges of the spirite of God.

1.Corinth. 2.14.

But to come to the matter: that word of GOD that soundeth into our eares, is an instrument ordained and directed by the Holie-ghost to teach vs, that so wee maye vnderstande suche thinges as are needefull to bee vnderstoode for saluation, and may by true faith applie vnto our selues suche thinges as wee vnderstoode, and haue receiued vnto. And this speeche of GOD talking so with vs, is sometimes naked, as it were, and simple, and sometimes againe, is so decked and trimmed, as it were, with other things, that euen the matter it selfe, by reason of the rites and orders, annected to the speech, seemeth after a sort, not to be spoken, but to be doone. Examples of the naked or bare speech, are these infinite promises of the gospell: as when wee heare this, GOD so loued the worlde that hee gaue his onelie begotten Sonne, that whosoeuer beleeueth in him shoulde not perishe, but haue eternall life. So

The word by it selfe.

The worde with the sacraments annexed therto.

Ioha.3.16.

we

we reade, and daily heare in the church, the writings of the Prophets & Apostles, hauing exhortations, reprehensions, and comforts adioyned to the same, according as good sheepheards, do their duetie, publikely and priuately. And yet there are sometimes ioyned to this word of GOD some signes, with certaine rites and orders, that so the speeche may not onelie beate orders, but also the thinges that are looked vppon may come to our sight. And these are those thinges that the Latine writers call sacraments: and therefore Augustine also called them visible words.

August. cont. Faust. Memictiæ lib. 19 cap. 16. & habit. tom. 6. col. 349.

This verilye is certaine, that euen the most auntient Latine diuines did interprete that Greeke worde, Mysterie, by the Latine word Sacrament, and that not onelie in places where mention is made, of the rites and orders of the Sacraments of the church, as of Baptisme and the Lords supper, but generally wher the question is of suche thinges as are of themselues close & secret, and far remoued from common vse. So the calling of the Gentiles which the Apostle nameth a mysterie, is of the olde Latine interpreter

Ephes. 1.

1.Timoth.3.16. turned, sacrament. And our whole saluation, is the sacrament of godlinesse with him: and the coniunction of Christ, & his church, & not the marriage of man & wife, as commonlie thorough ignorance menne haue supposed, is with him a sacrament likewise, yea & in the reuelation he mentioneth the sacrament of that vncleane harlot, and the beast that carried hir.

Ephes.5.32. Apocal.17.7.

To be short, nothing is more common amongest the Latine diuines, or commeth more often in their writings, than this worde, sacrament. And yet the Latine church hath in a more secret and narrowe signification taken and vnderstoode this terme, sacrament, namelie, for the signes and rites, which God hath adioyned to his promises, that so hee might the more fully seale vp in our hearts, the saluation that he hath reuealed vnto vs. And yet no other certainetie, so farre as I knowe, or can remember is this worde, mysterie, in the Apostles writings, vsed in that sense or signification.

Sacrament, how it is vsed amongest vs.

Uerilie, the name or word, sacrament, it selfe is amongest the Latinists of many significations: for which doubtfulnesse of the worde, we that nowe come in the last

laſt age of the woꝛlde doo ſuſtaine manye and great ſmartes. The Apoſtle calleth circumciſion, a ſigne and a ſeale: and (to ſpeake plainely, as the matter it ſelfe requireth) though I doo not willinglie depart from woꝛdes in vſe, leaſt one inconuenience and miſchiefe might be heaped vppon an other, yet I hadde leiffer that the Latin authours and wꝛiters, had ſtill kept Paules woꝛde. Roman. 4 11.

But that we may at the length come to the purpoſe, let that rite oꝛ oꝛder of the Loꝛdes ſupper bee a ſigne giuen vs from GOD, whereby hee will haue teſtified and ſealed vp vnto vs, the communication oꝛ partaking of the bodie and bloud of Chꝛiſt. But becauſe euery thing that is vſed, in, and about this holie banquet, is not of one ſoꝛt, maner, oꝛder, and reſpect, we are therefoꝛe to marke, that euen this woꝛde, ſacrament, and that in this moꝛe narrowe ſignification, is of the olde Latine diuines taken thꝛee manner of ways. Foꝛ ſometimes they vnderſtand by ſacraments, the verie whole action, in which reſpect both baptiſme and the Loꝛds ſupper it ſelfe alſo, are called ſacraments, that is to ſay, myſtical actions oꝛ outwarꝛd

What the lords ſupper is.

The word Sacrament, in the narrow ſignification taken three waies.

rites, which doo represent to our vnderstanding some other certaine thing. Sometimes againe not the whole action it selfe, but that which is vsed in that action, is so termed, as in baptisme the water it selfe, & the sprinckling or laying it on the party baptized: and in the Lords supper, bread & wine, with the rites and orders that christ himselfe ordained. And this againe, by a double manner of speech, for sometimes vnder this worde, there are meant onely the outward signes, as when Augustine affirmeth, that the wicked do eate Christ, as in respect of the sacrament. And sometimes it is vsed for the signes, ioyned with the very thing it selfe signified, as when Irenæus saith, that the sacrament consisteth of two things, one heauenlie, and the other earthlie: for hee calleth the heauenlie thing the body and bloud of christ, and the earthlie, the bread and the wine: and all that together hee nameth, the sacrament. And this much concerning the worde it selfe, or the name sacrament. Let vs now at the length come to the matter.

August.

Irenæus.

Sith nowe therefore, that euerie sacrament is a signe, wee must needes put the worde Sacrament in the predicament

of

of relation or relatiues, as the logicians call them, that is, amongst such things as haue mutuall respectes one of them to an other. And sith relation must needes be, amongest sundrie thinges which haue mutuall respect one of them to an other, wee must therefore of necessitie confesse, that in the sacraments there is a signe, and the thing signified. Neyther when I deliuer these 2 parts, which indeed do meete, or wherof in truth al sacraments do consist, do I shut out the word. Let the worde (saith Augustine) come vnto the element, and it shal become a sacrament. I do not therefore exclude or shut out the worde, which is, as it were, the life & soule of either of the parts, and to which the sacraments themselues, as wee haue saide before, are adioyned as seales. And thus farre foorth, euen they agree with vs, which otherwise doo most of all disseme from vs. Wherefore lette vs nowe see, which bee those signes, and which bee those thinges signified: for in this point we doo not all agree. Wee call water the signe in Baptisme, and the thing signified we call Christs bloud, by the washing whereof (we hauing obtained forgiuenes Augustin.

of sinnes, and being mortified in our flesh) we are saued.

But concerning baptisme I will not nowe say anie more. In the supper certainelie there are two signes, or rather, signes of two sortes. For some of them are certaine materiall and substantiall signes: as for example, the bread and wine, other-some are actions and sacramentall rites, which are not for all that vaine or superfluous acts, but haue there certaine sacramentall consideration and respect, from the Lordes institution, of whiche point wee will speake hereafter. I say then that in the Lordes supper, these are outward, materiall, visible, and as you would say palpable signes, that God hath annected vnto his word, euen the bread and wine.

This the Papistes denie, as who (after that they haue confessed, that the sacraments doo consist, of a signe, and a thing signified) doo yet notwithstanding afterwardes take the bare accidents of bread and wine, as, coulour, forme, and such like, for the signes themselues: for they maintaine, that in the Lordes supper there remaineth not, the substãce of bread

and wine, but that that vanisheth away, & that there cõmeth in the place thereof, the substance of the Lords bodie and bloud. Therefore in their iudgement, the signes shall be the accidents. And which I beseech you? Forsooth whitenesse, roundnes, and rednesse, if they consecrate red wine, which accidents they doo by a new name call kind, shew, or forme. But as Augustine rightlie teacheth: Unlesse there were a certeine analogie, proportion, and agreement betweene the things signified, & the signes themselues, they could not be counted sacraments. Now betweene accidents & substances there is no agreement, therefore the sacraments, as they call them, shal not be sacraments: for it behoueth the signes so to agree with the things signified, that they may represent to mẽs minds that which they signifie. I will speake somewhat more plainelie. If admonishing some one, I would haue him with his eies to behold, and with his mind to cõceiue a man, I will not set before him the image of a horsse, or of an ore, to looke vpon, because that outward shape or forme of an horsse, or of an ore, cannot beget in his mind the conceit, portrature, or image of

Augustine.

A similitude.

a man, although all these things, that is to say, man, horse, ore, &c. are referred to one generall word or terme, to wit, liuing creature: much lesse then shall the shape of an herbe, or forme of an horse, bring to my minde and memorie, the forme or shape of a man: and least of all others shall those accidents which are void of all substance, as whitenesse, rednesse, roundnesse, &c. call to my remembrance things that in deed are, to wit, the bodie & bloud of Christ. But it was the Lords purpose in his supper, to offer vnto our mindes and thoughts the verie food of our soules, that is to say, Christes bodie deliuered to death for vs, and his bloud shed for the forgiuenes of our sinnes, betweene which and those accidents, there is no proportion and agreement, whereas yet notwithstanding bread and wine, the verie food of our bodies in deed, doo most fitlie euen set before our verie eies almost, that same spirituall nourishment that we must haue from him.

In that papists, make the accidents of the elements the signes of the sacraments, there followeth three absurdities thereupon.

1

2

And sith no man can be fed by accidents, how can such accidents then represent that same eternall food? Furthermore, though by the meanes of some accidents,

3

materiall

materiall things may be set before our eies, yet all accidents doo not belong to, or agree with euerie matter: for manie both white and round things may be beheld, which shall not for all that represent a bodie: and who hath told them that the bread which Christ brake and gaue vnto his disciples, was white or round, in such sort as they bake it and make it? Therefore the true signes of Christes bodie and bloud, are the verie bread, and the verie wine, which thing the apostle declareth, saieng: The bread which we breake, is the communion or partaking of the bodie of Christ: and the cup that we blesse is the partaking of the bloud of Christ. And that same consubstantiation or transubstantiation, is a filthie forgerie and deuise of satan. 1.Corinth.10.16

Now let vs come to the thing signified: and first wee will declare, what manner and kinde of signification this is that wee speake of. For this is obiected against vs, partlie by some that know not what is deliuered and taught in our churches, and partlie by other some that doo maliciouslie slander vs, that wee saie wee set out to be beheld

Enemies to truth are of two sorts, that is, ignorant and malicious.

in the sacraments, as it were a vaine picture, or a certeine dead image, that maie stir vp in vs the remembraunce of Christ, when yet notwithstanding we are woont euerie where to beat vpon this point, that by the sacraments Christ is not signified vnto vs (as when we beholde Cesars image & picture we are woont to remember Cesar) and nothing beside: for in the signes, hauing the word adioined vnto them, we teach Christ and all his benefits to be so representes to vs and our mindes, that he, togither with all his graces is giuen to vs to be inioied of vs, and in deed to be participated, but yet after a spirituall maner, and by faith. Wherefore this action is not vaine, neither are the signes, and the very rites thereof naked & emptie matters, sith that which is signified, is both most truelie offered vnto vs by God himselfe, and most effectuallie receiued of such as beleeue. This kind of signification Bernard well declareth, by the similitude of a ring which the bridegrome deliuereth vnto the betrothed bride, to the end that so she may not onelie thinke vpon the bridegrome deliuering it, but that by this pledge of promise he might after a sort de-

liuer

liuer himselfe ouer vnto hir also. And therfore Christ did not onelie say: This is my bodie, but also he added, Take ye, and eat ye. Ye see brethren what we thinke and hold touching these mysteries: also what iniurie is offered vs, when men say, that we doo euacuat & disanull the sacraments, and transforme them into certeine vaine spectakles and shewes of Christ that is absent. Let vs notwithstanding as plainlie as possible we can declare, what that is which is so in outward signes, set before our minde to be looked into, that yet notwithstanding it is a faithfull and beleeuing soule trulie exhibited and offered, to be partaken by faith. And what is that I say? Truelie the bodie and bloud of the Lord. But who teacheth vs this, or so instructeth vs? Euen Gods owne sonne: for he saith: This (that is to say, This bread) is my bodie. And this (that is to say, This wine conteined in this cup) is my bloud. By the way, I will put you in minde of one thing, least anie man might be offended because I say not This is my bloud, in the masculine gender, but This is my bloud, in the neuter gender, referring it either to the wine, which is the neuter

Matth. 26. 28.

Mainteiners of the truth charged to be defacers of the sacraments.

Other mens malice must not hinder vs from speaking truth.

Matth. 26. 26. 28.

Contention about wordes though it be not alwaies good, yet when it may cleere the truth, it may well be vsed.

neuter gender in Latine, or to the cuppe, conteining the wine, which in Greeke is the neuter gender also: for though I loue not to striue about words, yet this point is well worthie the marking. Certeinlie he that saith: *Hic est sanguis meus*, in the masculine gender, that is, This is my bloud, doth point to, or shew foorth nothing but his bloud. But it is certeine, that as before Christ did not propound his bodie vnto his disciples without bread, so euen in this other part when Christ said so, he would not set his bloud before his disciples without wine. Therefore this Greeke Pronoune τοῦτο being of the neuter gender, must needs be referred to the signe (that is to say ποτήριον, the cup, which is therefore expresslie put downe in Paule) concerning which, or of which, the bloud it selfe may be spoken: whereupon this ariseth, that the Greeke Pronoune τοῦτο, this, cannot declare anie other matter or thing than this, that is to say, this thing or matter, which I hold in my hãds, to wit, the wine that is cõtained in this cup, which indeed cãnot be expressed by this word, *Hic*, a Pronoune of the masculine

masculine gender, as the meanest Grammarians may well and easilie perceiue. But to returne to the matter: By these thinges you may perceiue, what we vnderstand by the name or word of the thing it selfe, or by the terme trueth, sacramentallie signified, namelie the bodie & bloud of the Lord Iesus.

Christes verie bodie & bloud is the matter or thing signified in the Lords supper.

Wherefore first of all we dissent from the anabaptists, who in sted of the matter of the sacrament signified, doo put downe I knowe not what shadow or figuratiue thing, as though it were some warlike cognizance, pledge, or watch-word, by which christians might be discerned from such as be no christians.

1 In the matter of the supper we agree not, either with the Anabaptists or sacramentaries.

Next we dissent from them likewise, who for the matter of the Sacrament, established Christes force and power, as also his merites, but yet seuered from Christ himselfe. For Christ said not this is the merit of my bodie, which is deliuered for you, but This is my bodie, and this is my bloud: neither is it without cause definitiuelie before hand added, which is deliuered for you, and which is shed for you. So that it could not more plainelie haue beene said, that verie

2 Or with such as vnderstand it onelie, concerning Christes merits sundered from Christ himselfe.

Luke. 22. 19. 20.

verie Christ himselfe (whose bodie was giuen for vs, and whose bloud was shed for vs) is truelie and verilie giuen vs in the supper, to be the food of eternal life to vs. And therfore the matter of that sacrament is in deed that verie bodie which he offered vp for vs on the crosse, and that bloud which he shed for the forgiuenesse of our sinnes: so far off are we from deeming or thinking of some figuratiue or typicall bodie, or some allegoricall bloud, as certeine most fond men (who doo not indeed well vnderstand their owne wordes, minde, and opinion) are not ashamed to speake and write of vs, that we so holde.

Now I come to the third point of this discourse: for first I haue spoken of the signes, and secondlie of the things signified. Now we are to see in the third place, what is the knitting or ioining togither of the signes, and the thinges signified, wherein for the most part consisteth the whole determination of all this controuersie touching the sacraments. The papists haue altered the ioining togither of the signes, and the thing signified, into a transmutation or change one of them into another: than whith, what can be more absurd?

Two sorts of people that in the sacrament of the supper haue erred in and about the right coniunction of the signes, and the thing signified.

surd? For certeinlie, if the bread and the wine be in deede changed into the bodie and bloud of Christ, as they affirme, then we cannot chuse but affirme also, that this is not to ioine the signes with the thinges signified, but to change the signes into the thinges themselues, or else the signes vanishing away or perishing, to put the thinges themselues in their roome. But let these men go, as who in deed deserue not anie confutation, their assertions be so absurd and blockish. There are others, at this present no lesse hard & sharpe against vs, than the verie papistes themselues, who will haue the thing signified, that is to say, the verie bodie of Christ so to be ioined with or vnder, or in the bread, that in that verie place where that bread is, there must also be the bodie of Christ: which in like sort is to be vnderstood also, touching the wine and the bloud of Christ. If a man then should demand, where is the verie bodie & bloud of Christ in the action of the supper: if wee will answere according to their opinion, we must say, that it is truelie and in deed in our hands, and in our mouth, and therfore certeinelie, vnlesse it presentlie vanish a-

A grosse absurditie or two following consubstantiation.

way, within this bodie of ours, with, in, or vnder the verie signes of the bread & the wine, being eaten and drunken. Now we will shew, and that by reasons not fet from humane philosophie (as our aduersaries vntrulie say we vse such) but from the verie word of God it selfe, that this consubstantiation (as we may trulie call it) is no lesse absurd and erronious than transubstantiation, as also that that communion or partaking, which out of the pure word of God we propound and teach in our churches, is a most secret and diuine matter. Wherefore our iudgement is quite & cleane contrarie to either of those opinions before rehearsed. To begin, we hold that such things as are spoken of the sacraments, must be vnderstood sacramentallie. For what I pray you is or can be more vpright than to haue all thinges spoken, rightlie vnderstood and perceiued, as the nature of that matter will beare, whereof there is question? Certeinelie such thinges as the lawiers speake touching the law, must be vnderstood euen as they are vsed in that verie science of the law: and we must needs giue the selfe same iudgement of all things and arts whatsoeuer

Two things to be handled: viz. the confutation of the aduersaries, & the maintenance of the truth.

A similitude or two, explaning the point he hath in hand.

whatsoeuer. Such thinges therefore, as are taught and deliuered touching the sacraments, must be sacramentallie vnderstood. What manner of coniunction then is the coniunction or knitting togither of the signe and the thing sacramentallie signified? Uerilie it is sacramentall. The signes therfore, and the things are ioined togither by that relation or respect, which is betweene the signes and the thinges signified: which yet once againe, I doo most plainelie declare after this maner.

When we heare some man speaking vnto vs in the toong we vnderstand, the words that come to our eares and strike them, doo verie liuelie represent that vnto our mindes for the expressing and signification whereof they were vsed. For example: as soone as we heare the word Rome, presentlie wee thinke vpon that citie. If a man name Cesar or the emperour, Cesar or the emperour presentlie commeth to our memorie. The reason whereof verilie is that, that is well deliuered and taught in schooles: to wit, such thinges as are in the voice or words are signes of the affections, that are

Another similitude.

in the soule or minde. Where is the selfe same consideration to be had of the sacraments: for the sacraments are nothing else, but visible words, that is, representing, through our eies vnto our mindes, things signified, as words heard, doo by our eares conuey vnderstanding to our minds likewise. Therfore these visible sacraments of bread & wine bring to passe, that when I see and receiue that bread, and that wine ioined with the word of God, I doo withall conceiue in my mind, and vnderstand, that bodie that was giuen for me, and that bloud that was shed for me, as though I were led or carried euen vnto the thing it selfe being present. And because I am commanded not onelie to looke vpon these signes with mine eies, but also to take them, eat them, drinke them, therefore dooth the faithfull minde euen lay hold of, and applie vnto himselfe those things so signified, as they are deliuered and offered. Touching which point we will largelie discourse in the fourth place, to wit, when we shall come to handle this question, how both the signes and the thinges signified are receiued of vs: whereas now we onelie dispute or speake

Math. 26. 26. 27.

touching

touching the sacramentall coniunction of the signes themselues, with the thing signified. Such as are not content with this sacramentall coniunction, fall into a double errour, not onelie that they doo in a great and grosse errour verilie establish a real vnion of the signes with the things signified, of which we haue spoken before: but also they further adde this, that euen in that verie place whersoeuer the signes are offered to such as come to communicate, there is present the flesh and the bloud of Christ, that is to say, they would haue vs confesse that euen his verie humanitie or manhood is in deed present there, and is to be receiued or taken by bodily instruments. As for vs, we affirme that Christ in respect of his manhood, euen as when he was vpon the earth, was no where else, but in that verie place where he was conuersant, so now he is not anie where else, but aboue all heauens, into which he ascended: and that therefore he is not now togither with the signes offered to the bodie, but togither with the signes truelie deliuered and giuen to the beleeuing soule, euen as by the word we heare it, and by the signe we see

Two errours mainteined by the aduersaries.

The substance of that we are to know or beleeue, touching the coniunction of the signes with the things signified in the Lords supper.

it. Now it remaineth that we doo by some reasons set from the word of GOD well wey and consider whether they or we swarue from the truth.

The first reason. Rom.1.3, Rom.9.5. Galath.4.4. Philip.2.7. Hebr.2.16. Iohn.16.7.28. Matth.28.20. Act.1.9.

The holie scripture witnesseth, that the sonne of God did personallie take vnto himselfe a true and verie bodie. The selfe same scripture dooth attribute vnto the flesh of our sauiour Christ assumed, and that both before and after the glorification thereof, such things as doo plainelie proone the truth of a naturall bodie, as that he came, that he went away, that he was sometimes present, and sometimes absent. These things then doo of necessitie follow the trueth of Christes bodie, which if a man take from it, he must also needs take away the truth of the manhood of Christ, and so come at the length to the heresie of the Marcionits or Dokits. But these things are manifestlie taken away, by their opinion, who say that Christes flesh is now also and that in deed and verilie present, both into the heauens, into which he ascended, and in the earth likewise, and that also in all places,

Marcionits or Dokits, they were called Marcionits of one Marcion, whose principall error was this, that Christ did not appeare indeed, and suffer indeed, &c. vpon the crosse, but in phantasie or ghostlike apparition.

Concerning Dokitiæ see homil.1. before going.

Tertullian wrote most learnedlie against this Marcion.

places, in which that bread and that wine is deliuered or giuen to such as come to receiue it. I will say nothing of them that are not ashamed to affirme that Christes flesh euen from the verie first moment of the personall vnion, was togither and in deed present, both in the crib, and in the heauen, yea euerie where present. To this first of all they answere: that Christes bodie cannot without great wickednesse, be made subiect to the law of nature, for that bodie that was taken into the vnitie of the person, hath receiued farre other vnmeasurable gifts and graces.

The aduersaries obiection.

But heere I beseech you wey well what we answer: We confesse that there is great regard to be had of that same grace and gift of the personall vnion, by which wee cannot but confesse that the manhood of our sauior Christ was so highly exalted, that onelie the Deitie or Godhead excepted (according to which he is euen greater than himselfe) it hath atteined and gotten a name, which is aboue all names, that is to saye, that all things created are subiected vnto the same, yet for all that, that followeth not heerevpon,

The answer.

Philip. 2. 9. 10.

which these men coldlie suppose, or fondly imagine: for this is the question now betweene vs, whether Christes manhood do in deed place it selfe euerie where, or in manie places togither at one time, to be receiued with our hands and mouth, and not what it hath obteined from another, or in respect of the other nature, to which it is personallie vnited: but rather whether this proprietie (which in deed is proper to the Godhead alone) be in the manhood, to wit, to be euerie where, or in diuers places at one and the selfe same season. And this is that matter which the schoolemen haue by a barbarous word, if you respect terms, but not by an vnfit word, if men will wey the matter, called by the name of habitual grace. Now this difference being alreadie put downe, which skarslie anie vnlesse they be altogither most contentious, will denie, we say, that such doo in deed euacuat Christ, or make him of no force, as denie Christes flesh, as in respect of another, that is to say, not in it selfe, but according as it is ioined to another, to wit, so farre forth, as it is personallie vnited with the person of the word, to be truelie and in deed euerie where: much lesse will

Schoole men faile manie times in terms, but now and then hit the matter.

Though Christ man, be not euerie where, yet Christ God and man is euerie where.

will wee denie him to be present in that place, whersoeuer in the worlde his supper is administred. For why should wee denie, that concerning christs flesh, which in a certaine measure hath place in al bodies: yea, euen there where som one whole thing, is become or made one, after an other sort, than by personall vnion. A tree or a house is many times saide to be in a riuer, whereas yet notwithstanding the vpper part, either of the one or of the other, appearing aboue the water or riuer, and being considered in it selfe, is indeed in the aire, and not in the water: in like sort, I am said to sit in this seat or chaire, whereas yet notwithstanding, I sit, but in one part of my bodie onelie. Likewise I am saide to speake, whereas onelie the tongue, considered, in, and by it selfe, speaketh. The reason and trueth of these speeches dependeth vpon this, that a tree, a house, a man, &c: is one selfe-same whole thing, compacted and made of his seueral partes. For otherwise that coulde not be truely affirmed or saide, of two things in deede separated and sundered one of them from an other. So a man may truely affirme whole christ to be euerie where, and

A similitude.

Application of the similitude.

there-

therfore much more with the bread in the supper, and yet no otherwise, but so farre forth as Christ is considered, as some one whole substance and beeing, and so also as the proprieties of the natures bee not by this meanes confounded. But the whole of Christe, that is to saye, euerye thing belonging to Christ, can not therfore for all that, bee sayde to bee anye where else, than to bee conuersant in one place, at one and the selfe-same time: for that can no more be spoken of Christs humanitie in it selfe (vnlesse wee will with Eutyches and Brentius, confounde the proprieties of either nature) than this my hande can bee saide to sitte, or these my feete may be said to speake. If there be any that vnderstande not these things, I beseech them to learne to vnderstande the same, and to haue more regarde and consideration, both of themselues, and of others, through whose sides, they would, if they could destroy the truth it selfe.

Eutyches. Brentius.

He turneth that vpon the aduersaries which they obiected against the truth.

To come to the point. They doo not spoile the manhoode of Christ, of that his infinite maiestie, who teach that flesshe of his to be the flesh of the Sonne of God, but they rather that transtourme and change

chaunge him who is God and man in one person, and make him but to beare or cary God or the godhead: neither yet do they spoile ỹ manhood of his maiestie, or bring him backe vnto the state and condition of other men, which according to the grace that they call habituall (that is to saye, cleauing to the verie flesh of Christ, as, if it were to his peculiar subiect or matter whereunto it shoulde sticke) doo acknowledge it to bee vnspeakablye more high and excellent than all other thinges whatsoeuer wythout exception (excepting onely the godhead of the worde, according to which he himselfe is greater than himselfe, as we said before) but they indeede bring it to nothing, or into some image or signe in their owne conceipts at the leaſt, who, while they goe about to attribute supernaturall thinges vnto him, attributing yet notwithstanding vnnatural things to him, or thinges against nature, do of necessity destroy and ouerthrowe, euen mans nature it selfe: for that ceaseth to be humane, which hauing lost the essentiall propreties thereof, must needes cease to be ỹ which before it was. But we will incounter with thē by an other reson.

If

If this verilie be to diminish Christs glorie, and to debase his maiestie, to affirme, that hee can not indeede be at one time in manie places, howe much more then must this be the debasing of hym, to say, that hee was mortall, yea, that hee did indeede die? And yet wee see, that this is that, which the Apostle alleageth for the commendation of the most excellent loue that the Sonne of GOD carried towardes vs, which was yet so muche the more great and excellent, by howe much he did the more debase himselfe.

Rom.5,6,7,8,&c Philip.2.8.

Nowe then, if the reall taking of all infirmities vppon himselfe (sinne onelie excepted) hath taken nothing at al from his glorie, or impaired and lessened the same, how much lesse hath this doone it, that he hath for euer taken, together with verie flesh, the verie properties of flesh, and that vnchangeably, and without confounding?

Hebr.4.15.

Another obiection. The answeare thereto.

But they obiect further, that they meane not to abolish those properties. Thē they must needes attribute contrarie thinges, to one and the self-same subiect, & that altogether in one and the self-same respect, to wit, to be circumscribed and tied to a place, which is the naturall propertie of

an

an instrumentall body; and yet notwithstanding, at one and the self-same time to be both in heuen, and in innumerable places, or else, euerye where, if you will, in earth: and so one and the selfe-same flesh shall haue a quantity sette it, and also bee without quantitie, that is to say, shal be both a bodie, and not a bodie. And what is this else, I pray you, but to make euery thing of ante thing, as wee commonlie say: but let vs heare what they do yet further obiect. They will haue that time that went before the glorifieng of our sauior Christs flesh, to be distinguished from that time, in which that his flesh was receiued vp into glorie. We grant it: but withall we say, that if this reall coniunction of the flesh with the bread, doo depend of the glorification of Christes flesh, it can haue no place, in that first institution of the supper, because this flesh was not as then glorified, but rather most nie to debasing & humbling. Besides this flesh is offred vnto vs at this present to be partaken by vs, not as glorious or glorified, but (that I may so speake) euen, as it were, hanging vppon the crosse. Against this exception, they oppose and set the miracle

The aduersaries absurditie aswel against reason as religion.

The third obiection.

An answeare thereto taken from a double absurditie.

A.

B.

The transfiguration of Christ mentioned, Math. 17. 2. 3. & 9 feareth not the aduersaries.

racle of Christes transfiguration. But what agreement is there betwixt these two things? For of a truth, nothing vnnaturall or against nature fel out in ỹ transfiguration, neither was there any thing there done, that did destroy or ouerthrowe the essential proprieties of christs flesh: euen as righteous men shal not therfore or then cease to be very men, when they shall shine as the sun, or brightnes of the firmament or stars. But to be euery where, or in many places at one time, is a property so cõtrary to al things created (as which are indeed finite) that it belongeth onely vnto the godhead alone, because that alone is infinite. To conclude, we do in one worde as it were, answeare thus. Glorification tooke not from Christs body a corporal or bodilie nature (that is to say, quantity or circumscriptiblenes) but it abolished the infirmitie & weaknes therof, which weaknes he for a time tooke vppon him. Nowe by the worde infirmity or weaknesse, wee meane not any essential proprietie in christes flesh, but that onely which sin brought into mans nature, yet altogether without the spot or taint of sin, as it was in christ. This is that I meane: where Christs flesh is

Daniel. 12. 3.

Glorification, and wherein it standeth.

is saide to bee infirme and weake, before the glorification of it, that is not spoken in respect of the Godhead: to the which hee alwayes hath bin, is, and shall be inferior: but in consideration of that great glory, into which afterwards that his flesh was exalted, yet so that there must alwayes remaine safe and sound (as I haue said heretofore) those properties, of which the very truth of the body it selfe consisteth: amongest which, quantity, and therfore circumscriptiblenes obtaineth so excellent & notable a place, that Cyrill feareth not to affirme, that God hymself could not possibly bee euery where, if hee were partaker of quantity. Therfore these mē I mean both Vbiquitaries and Antiphisitæ, hauing openly denied the quantity of Christs flesh, must either gette them to Eutyches his tents, and take part with hym: or if out of the words of Christ (who after hys resurrection, willeth some to beholde & feele him) they wil prooue, that he hath not put off the quantity of hys flesh, then they must shewe vs, that Christes flesh, according to the quantity thereof, can be at one tyme euerye where, or in manye places, whych euen the godhead it selfe,

Cyrillus.

They affirme Christes bodie to be euery where.

He calleth them so, because they set themselues against nature and reason.

Iohn.20.27.

if

if it haue quantitie, can not perfourme, as Cyrill openly and truly writeth, whose authoritie otherwise, these men doo most especiallie abuse: for this reall presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar: yea, they must proone, that the Angelles lied, when they saide: Hee is risen, hee is not heere. For whatsoeuer distinction they may vse, if wee can shewe a place where Christes flesh is not, then wee are sure it can not be euery where: and if it can not bee euerye where, then neither can the whole flesh it selfe be at one time, and together in manie places. Hence also it may appeare, howe absurde and vnreasonable Brentius his opinion is, and those that followe him, who attribute these wordes of the Apostle, The forme of God, and the forme of a seruant, to the onely humanitie or manhood of Christ in it selfe. For they vnderstand by the forme of God, that their owne forgerie and deuise of all maiestie, and all presence, as they call it, with which, as they saye, the flesh of Christ was verily in it selfe indued from the very first moment of the personall vnion, which it pleased him for a time not to make manifest; and this is it they

Matth. 28. 6.

Brentius and his followers.

Philip. 2. 6, 7.

they meane by the worde, humbling and abasing. And the forme of a seruant they call that state and condition, in which it pleased him to remain, so often as he would not vse the forme of God. Very well saide surelie: if a man wil attribute to one subiect or matter, two essentiall formes, what shall he els doe, but confound one and two together, and make them both one? And what is that else, but to bee mad outright? Then it remaineth, that by this worde or terme, forme, these men vnderstand, neyther the godhead it selfe, nor the manhood, but a diuers conditiō and state of this his manhood, as which inwardly, & in it selfe, was beautified and adorned, with all the powerfull graces & effects of the godhead powred into the same, and yet that he did not alwaies manifest and disclose them.

He confuteth Brentius, and such as maintaine him, as vsurpe the place of the Philippians, or rather falsely interpreting it.

But if this be true, we must learn to define the personal vnion, not by the effusion or powring foorth of effectual graces, but of vertues rather. Moreouer, vnderstand as large an effusion and powring foorth of giftes and graces into the flesh, as possibly a man can, I woulde faine see, or heare some that coulde tell me, how it shal not be a most open blasphemie for a man

Two absurdities or errours.

1

to affirme, that the manhoode may by any meanes, wythout robberie be made equall to the godhead: What shall become of that sentence so often repeated in the ancient Fathers and olde writers, to wit, that the Sonne as in respect of his flesh, is lesse than the Father, and inferiour vnto him, yea, and therefore lesse than himselfe, and inferiour vnto himselfe, because hee is, as in respect of his godhead coequall with his Father? Wherefore that interpretation is to bee refused as false, yea, as wholie and altogether sauoring of the heresie of Eutyches. They alleadge yet this also: The place (saye they) is not of the substaunce of a bodie: and that therefore the substaunce of the body is not abolished, though place bee taken away from it.

An other obiection of the aduersaries.

Certainely it would greeue me to the heart, to beholde the maintainers of consubstantiation, to bee so driuen to their shiftes, that by propounding such absurde things, they should giue themselues ouer to be scorned of the most popish and grose maintainers of Transubstantiation (vpon whose foundation, yet notwithstanding they builde vp their owne conceipts:) saThe answeare.

uing

uing that I see, euen those very defenders of Transubstantiation themselues (who haue bin brought vp with the teats of that most filthie sowe Sarbona) to be so thrust to the wall in this point, that they supposed, that with this dirt, the truth might be so dawbed ouer, that it shoulde not lie open to euery mans eie and sight. What woonderfull impudencie and shamelesnes is this (beare wyth me brethren, and pardon me, O yee hearers this my most inst sorrow and greefe) for men to deale so sophistically and subtilly in Gods church, which is the schoole-house of trueth? Any man indued with reason can hardly be ignorant of this, that this worde bodie is somtimes referred to substance, and somtimes to quantity. Therefore a bodie is sometimes called, a corporall or bodilie substaunce, consisting of matter, forme, and substaunce: and sometimes it is called that which consisteth of three dimensions or mesurings, to wit, length, bredth, and depth. So in this question somtimes wee consider Christs bodie, as that same materiall, substantiall, visible, and palpable thing, which Christ tooke vnto him for our sake: and after this sorte verilie

The name of a college in Paris, where the popish diuines are maintained.

He very notably corrected himselfe.

The worde Bodie in authors referred to two predicaments, to wit. substance and quantitie, but yet in diuers respects.

quantitie, as it is an accident, is not parte of that substaunce. And sometimes againe, wee vse this worde bodie, that so, that which is defined, by that three-fold quantitie, may be the better distinguished and knowne, from that which is without quantitie. And after this manner verily, these men must either proove, that the definition dooth not declare the substance of these thinges which are defined: or else they must with vs confesse, that a bodie is nothing else, but that verye three-folde quantitie continue, as they call it, that is to say, such a quantitie, as whose parts are ioined together in a common terme.

The aduersaries must either conclude against reason, or else yeelde to the trueth.

If this be once taken away, it cannot be denied, but that of necessitie christs true and very bodie must perishe, whether wee consider it, as it is glorified, or as it is set in weakenesse: yea, Christ himselfe shall be accused of lieng, who proueth the truth of his flesh euen after his resurrection, by those inseparable accidents, that is to say, his corporall or bodily quantity.

Hitherto wee haue spoken of the bodie, nowe let vs see what may be saide touching the place. What if out of Augustines

He passeth to an other discourse touching the word Place.

plaine

plaine and euident woordes wee should saye: Take from bodies space of places, they shall be no where: and because they shall be no where, they shall not bee at all: What will they say to this: That is true in other bodies will they say, but in Christs bodie not so, or, it agreeth not thereto. But I answeare, that it dooth most fitlie agree to Christes body, of the absence of which from the earth, Augustine dooth most properlie reason in that Epistle. Augustine.

And truly, if it were true, that christs body were in diuerse respectes different from ours, then he could not be of the selfe same substaunce with vs, and like vnto vs in all things (sinne onely excepted.) I will adde yet somewhat more, that the matter may appeare more plaine, though by that which hath beene saide, it be euident enough. When wee affirme, that a place can not be sundered or taken from a body, that is, from that thing, which consisteth of three dimensions or measurings before mentioned (which thing the maintainers of consubstantiation do, whē they flee to those same starting holes of his omnipotencie or almightie power, Hebr. 4. 15. He explaneth the question.

The word place considered after two sortes.

which hereafter wee will God willing discouer) wee meane not by this woord place, some peculiar space, which by and by may be altered and changed, as when Christ departing from one place went to an other: for after this sorte this or that place is so euident to the body, that by most light & easy motion, one being remoued or taken away, another succeedeth: but we cal a place that same condition or state, of a true & very instrumentall body wherby it necessarily followeth, that whersoeuer the thing it selfe is, it must be circumscribed in that place, or tied therto, neither can it, while it is there be in any other place. This accident, though it be not the verie substance of the body, as in respect that ỹ bodie it self is a substance, yet verilie as it is a quantity it formeth & frameth the body, and it is an inseparable accident of the body, aswell as of the substance. So that there is no man (I suppose) but hee vnderstandeth how vaine and sophisticall that exception is. But (say they) Christs body walked vpon the waters: therefore they do not presently take away the truth of Christes body, that attribute vnto it an extraordinary condition, or such a state

An other obiection with the answere therto. Math. 14. 25, &c.

as

as can not be declared. And who (I pray you) denieth this, or any part of it? The question is not, whether Christ as in respect of his flesh, and that in the time of his infirmitye and weaknes also, could accomplish many things ouer and beside the ordinary lawes of mans nature. But this is the question, whether this doctrine concerning the reall presence of Christes very flesh in many, or all places at once, can stand with the truth of Christs flesh, whether wee consider it, after or before the glorification thereof.

The state of the question in controuersie.

Now we stoutly and safely deny that Christs flesh at any tyme, can be in many, or in all places at once, and wee saye, that it can not by anye necessary or fitte consequence bee gathered, either from this his walking vpon the waters, or in that hee entered into the place where his disciples were, the dores being shut, or in that hee arose againe, the stone of the Sepulchre or Toombe, not beeing remooued or rolled awaye by mannes handes. And of this wee haue sundrye reasons: for firste these myracles seeme rather to bee doone, in the waters themselues, made harde and firme, not one-

Iohn.20.19. Math.28.2.

Certain reasons alledged for proofe of his assertion.

lie vnder Christs feete, but vnder Peters also, than in Christs owne bodie, the like whereof also is to bee saide touching the wall and sepulchre, the heape or weight whereof did sodainely yeelo vnto the body of the creator. Moreouer, though we shold grant that they were to be seene in the very body of Christ, yet doth not the withholding of a bodily weight, or the withdrawing of it for a time, or else this thinnesse, as a man woulde say, of a bodilie heape, either abolish a bodie it selfe (sith it dooth at any hand, take away the quantitie of a body) or implie contradiction, as they are woont to say in the schooles. But we affirme, that a true and very bodie, can neither want quantity or circumscriptiblenesse, but it shal cease to be a bodie; neither can it be at once in one place, as circumscribed, and in an other place, as not circumscribed, but that we must of necessitie conclude, both that it is a bodie, and that it is not a bodie, which are assertions meerelie contrarie. The summe of all these thinges is this, or tendeth to this ende: namelie, that this opinion of the reall consubstantiation of Christes flesh with bread and wine, is most false

Matth. 14. 29.

2

3

and

and vntrue, as by meanes whereof the trueth of Christes flesh is vtterlie abolished. Now againe, euen by this most weightie argument following, may this forgerie and deuise be confuted, namelie because it plainlie and wholie standeth vp against the analogie and proportion of faith, so little need, or iust cause haue the defendors thereof, to call vs backe to the power and force of faith. The scripture witnesseth in manie places, that Christes flesh ascended vp aboue the heauens, and that there also at this day it remaineth, we may not therefore seeke for it in earth: otherwise it should not be an ascending, but a vanishing away for the time. Certeinlie, no man can truelie be said to come or go vp thither, where he now was, or to go away, descend, or be absent from the place where he remaineth. Looke therefore in how manie places these things are spoken of Christ, according to his flesh, and that without anie figuratiue kinde of speech by so manie most strong and inuincible testimonies, there is confirmed vnto vs the true taking away of the bodie of Christ from vs, and also that reall votage of the presence of Christes flesh vpon the earth.

The second reason against consubstantiation. See the first before, pag. 65.

Acts. 1. 11. Marke. 16. 19.

A generall rule.

earth, ỳ is to say, thys opinion which the Dokits & Marcionits maintetne sufficientlie confuted. As for that that they vrge against vs, saieng: How absurd is that, that Christes flesh is now in heauen and no where else? It is easilie answered, that we speake no otherwise than Peter, yea than the angels themselues haue spoken. And though they say further, that by this meanes we shut vp Christ, as it were in a prison, where as yet notwithstanding the right hand of God (that is to say, his heauenlie power and authoritie) whereat he sitteth is euerie where. What for all this? Answer vs this, and tell vs whether that being on the earth, & absent from heauen (for he had not ascended thither where he was then present) or whether that being in the virgins wombe, or wrapped vp in swadling clothes, lieng in the crib, he was shut vp in prison? Yea sith euerie bodie is conteined in his owne place, yea & things without bodies, are yet notwithstanding included in the proprietie of their nature (for onelie the Godhead is infinit) what can follow elle of this their most absurd argument and reason, than that all things are full of prisons and prisoners? And though

Of these see before, pag. 70.

An obiection answered.

Acts. 3. 21.
Acts. 1. 11.

Absurditie in reason, by the aduersaries argument.

though we should say, that vnder ỹ termes of sitting at the right hand, there is meant the verie selfe same thing which the apostle simplie and without trope saith, that Christ (to wit as he is man) hath receiued, that is to say, a name aboue all names, yet it should be no lesse fond and absurd, therupon to gather and conclude the presence of Christes flesh in euerie place, that if we would affirme that the bodie of some king is as large and wide, as the bounds of his kingdome are broade. But say they, Christ being present gouerneth all things. We answer, that is true, as he is God, and yet the person of Christ is not for al that rent in sunder or diuided. For euen Christ man, being euerie where the Lord, is present also euerie where, much more in the supper, howbeit not as in respect of the manhood it selfe, but as in regard of another, that is to say, as he is one person, not in himselfe as in regard of his manhood, but in the verie nature of the Godhead it selfe, of which the humanitie was so assumed, that it is one subsistence or being together with it, as a little while ago we declared. Therefore the man Christ is indeed present, to wit, as he the selfe same

Philip. 2. 9.

A similitude.

Another obiection answered.

In what respect Christ is present euerie where.

same is Christ God, and yet the manhood of Christ is not now in anie other place than in heauen. But it is yet further obiected, that Christ went vp into heauen to fulfill all things. I grant it: whereupon also I gather, that hee fulfilled not all things, till he ascended, and that therefore the definition of the personall vnion taken from habituall grace, as they call it (of which we haue said somewhat before) is false and fond. Yea, I gather this further, that if he did truelie and in deed ascend, that that his flesh was not in heauen before he ascended thither, & that it ceaseth to be on the earth, after that he ascended from thense into heauen. But say they, he ascended to fulfill or fill all things: therefore he filleth all things. We answer that he performed that, for which he ascended, that is to say, he filled or fulfilled ỹ whole mysterie of our saluation, which the prophets foretold, and the full state whereof (as in respect of that for the performance of which Christ came into the world) is finished by Christs ascension, as it had the beginning of it from his comming into the earth. But if we had rather refer these words (which also we may do) to the fruite

The third obiection answered. Ephes. 4. 10.

The same obiection vrged, yet answered.

that

that followed his ascension into heauen (by which, not as a seruant, but as a sonne he tooke vpon him, and entered into the kingdome and gouernment) then we shall perceiue, that he therefore ascended, that sending downe the Holie ghost, he might bestow vpon his church all necessarie gifts, for he ascended that he might euen lade men with his graces, and heape vp benefits, blessings, and gifts vpon them, which seeing the apostle himselfe speaketh euen in so manie words as it were, what man in his right wit would beleeue them, that will transfer that to the verie person of Christ, which is spoken of the office of his kingdome, and the mightie and effectuall power thereof. But they yet further say, he was taken out of their sight, or he vanished away from it. I grant it, but if from hense they may gather, this their presence in all places, or in manie places, or that which they call maiestie euerie where (it is woonderfull and pitifull to behold, what monstrous opinions in a verie short space haue sprong vp) why may not we affirme the same likewise touching Philip? for he suddenlie did so vanish out of the Eunuches eies & sight, that

Iohn 14.28.

Ephes. 4.8.

The fourth obiection answered.

Luke. 24.31.

Acts. 8.39.40.

that he was found afterward at Azotus. And what was woont sometimes to betide the prophets themselues, appeareth by the example of Elias his disciples. An other place they obiect Stephan saw Christ, therefore he was on the earth. I denie that, for he being on earth, saw him set in heauen, as the holie history declareth. And to what purpose I pray you, should he see him in heauen, if he be at his side, on the earth? So that this miracle is to be considered, not in the verie bodie of Christ, but in Stephans eies. Neither did that rite and ceremonie of the church, vsed from all antiquitie, whereby men with a loud voice were admonished to haue their hearts lifted vpward, saieng: Lift vp your hearts, tend to any other end, but to cause men to mount vp to heauen. For to what purpose should that saieng, Lift vp, be vsed, if wee had that in our mouths and in our hands which we seeke for? Againe: Christ was seene of Paule as he went to Damascus. Augustine shall answer this for vs. He writing vpon the fourth and fift psalmes, saith: The head that was in heauen, cried alowd for the bodie that was in the earth. Much like vnto

2. Kings. 2 3.
The fift obiection.
Acts 7. 35. 36.

The vse of these words: Lift vp your hearts, in the celebration of the supper.

The sixt obiection answered.
1. Corinth. 15. 8.
Acts. 9, 4. 5. &c.
August. in psal. 54.

vnto this forme, is that which they yet obiect, namelie that Paule saw the Lord, when he praid in the temple: therfore the Lord was in the verie temple, we confesse that he saw him, but in a vision or trance. It was therfore a spirituall vision, neither belongeth it anie whit at all to this present matter in hand: and yet though we say it was a spirituall vision, we meane not that Paule saw any false or forged thing. Hitherto also we must refer other words of the same apostle, seeming to tend to the same end, for they may receiue the same answer likewise. They run at the last to ỳ same starting hole or shift (which I call by that name, as in respect of them that doo abuse it) of the almightie power of Christ. And when we set against them this sure ground, that God cannot performe somethings, then they throw out against vs bitter outcries, as though that we were manifestlie and altogither blasphemous and euill men. For mine owne part I would require this one thing of them, that they would with an vpright mind suffer such as amongst vs shall answer them, and that they would not be caried so friuolouslie, yet weaklie (the Lord knoweth

Acts.22.17.

The last shift of the aduersaries fullie answered.

The authors request to the aduersaries, standing vpon two parts.

knoweth) against such, as whose life (God be thanked for it) freeth them from all suspition of blasphemie. If euerie one denie the power of God that saith there is something which God cannot doo, then they certeinelie were blasphemers, that said, God deceiued, God lied, and that he could not die. Yea but they will say, that in as much as these things are not of anie part of his power, but rather imbecilities and wants, this is not to make GOD weake or feeble, but most mightie rather. And this certeinelie is the same, that long ago amongst others, Theodoret did answere the Eutychian heretiks, who defended this verie selfe same doctrine, by the verie selfe same reason. Let vs stay heere then a while, and as we say in the prouerbe, pitch our staffe for a season. It is without all controuersie or doubt, that God, who at the first made all things of nothing, is able vtterlie to turn all things vp side downe, yea euen with his verie becke or breath to abolish and destroy them all: and yet for all that he cannot effect or bring to passe this, that that which hath beene should not be, or that some one thing should be and not be, at one

The first reason.

Theodoretus.

Certeine things that God cannot doo.

one & the selfe same time, or that it should at one and the selfe same time, be such a thing, and not such a thing. The reason is because of two contradictorie speeches, one of them must of necessitie be false: but sith he is God in deed, he cannot lie, and therefore he cannot either will or do such things as are contradictorie contrary one of them to another. Wherefore he shall convince GOD of lieng and himselfe of follie, whosoeuer he be, that will cloke and couer Gods almightie power with this deuise, by which Christes bodie is circumscriptible, and yet it shall in deed togither be present in manie places at once (which properlie belongeth to that onelie infinit nature) whereby also this is forged & framed, to wit, that the bodie is finite and infinite, great and not great, yea a bodie and not a bodie. And this I dare aduouch further: Whatsoeuer God would once haue without exception, to be vnchangeable, that cannot be changed by him, much lesse can it be abolished or doone away: the reason is, because God cannot depart from himselfe, or be contrarie or vnlike vnto himselfe. And I make this without all doubt or controuersie, euen that such is

Numbers. 23. 19.

The second reason.

Christes bodie, namelie, that it hath alwaies beene, & must of necessitie for euer be, a verie or true bodie, and therefore also circumscriptible and tied to a place. Yea, this I say further, that God cannot be created by God, nor that a thing created can be turned into God: for if there were manie gods, he could not be God, to who another created wer equall, neither could that created god (so called abusiuelie) be God, because that to be God, & to haue a beginning of time or in time, are merelie contrarietie things or speeches. Christs flesh therefore could not become the Godhead, & therefore could it not be indued with ỹ incommunicable proprieties of ỹ Godhead, that is to say, with such proprieties belonging to the Godhead, as cannot be communicated to any other, but ỹ Godhead alone, amongst which, this, to be infinit, & to be wholie & at one time euerie where, is not reckoned in the last place. Is this I pray you to deny Gods almightie power? or do we in this follow ỹ vngodlines of ỹ blasphemous fellow Plinie? for he denieth that God is able to bestow immortalitie vpon mortall people, or to call backe again such as are dead: which is not only falslie, but wicked

The third reason.

The conclusion of this point.

Plinius, and his errors.

wickedly spoken also. The selfe same partie denieth that God is able to kill himselfe, or to bring to passe, that he that hath liued, and is now dead should not haue liued then when he liued, or that twise ten should not be twentie. And heerin howsoeuer he fel fouly in the former, he hath not missed the truth, but rightlie denied these things to be in God: onelie heerein he did most heastlie slip, that not knowing or beleeuing the nature of God, he would haue these things to be arguments and proofs of Gods imbecilitie and weaknesse, whereas contrariwise, we know and beleeue, that he cannot therefore doo these things, because he himselfe cannot perish, nor lie, nor be changed.

Truth may be propounded by some, though they perhaps doo not well vnderstand the cause thereof.

The cause why God cannot do some things, is not so much want of power in him, as because he cannot or will not be found contrarie to his nature.

But loe we are now at the length come to them, who seeme most equall and vpright aboue all other, who also auoiding all other forgeries and deuises, doo stay themselues onelie vpon these wordes of Christs: This is my bodie, and This cup is my bloud: we must say they beleeue Christes wordes though he speake neuer so new and vnaccustomed matters, yea though he speake things that our flesh and senses cannot beleeue. We grant all this.

Such answered as vrge the bare words: This is my bodie.

But what if they seeme not agreeable to the truth, and the analogie or proportion of faith? Uerilie they are to be beleeued indeed, seeing that the sonne of God is the truth it selfe, & yet these things or points must be so expounded, that they may altogether agree with the rest of the places of holie scripture, and the cheefe groūds or heads of christian religion: for whatsoeuer doth dissent, though it be neuer so little from these rules, must of necessitie be false and vnsound. Now we haue heeretofore at large declared and prooued, that such and so corrupt is that interpretation which establisheth either transubstantiation, or areall consubstantiation, of the signes and the things signified. But on the other side if we grant a sacramentall being of the thing signified (which as it is true in other sacraments, so also in this mystery) then we shall preserue the truth of Christes flesh, and vphold the analogie and proportion of faith. Wherefore this interpretation is to be admitted & receiued, as true, and well agreeing with right and sound doctrine. But say they, there is no place heere for a trope or figure: yea the verie plaine word is simplie to be obserued.

Two rules meet to be obserued in expounding such places, as seeme contrarie to truth.

Two christian frutes arising by expounding the words of the supper sacramentallie.

An obiection answered.

serued. But who I beseech you hath giuen you this rule speciallie, sith this is most manifest, yea and so vsuall also, that when they speake of sacraments (which also are themselues figures) they speake figuratiuelie. Neither thinke I that anie man can skarslie bring foorth or allege an example of a contrarie speech. You must therefore allege a cause, or render a reason, why that which is of force in other sacraments shuld not likewise be of strēgth and power in this sacrament, or speech touching the same. But let vs somewhat more nightie looke into the matter, and well wey all and euerie of the words of institution. First I demand, what the thing is pointed at, or painted out by this Pronoune demonstratiue, *Hoc*, that is, This. The papists answer, that it is an identicall proposition, that is, that one and the selfe same thing speaketh of it selfe, and that therfore nothing is shewed forth, but euen the verie bodie it selfe: as if a man should say: This thing is my bodie. But we say, that of necessitie that must be demonstrated & shewed, which he hauing taken & broken, did deliuer vnto his disciples, to wit, bread: which thing also the a-

The Pronoune Hoc, that is This, expounded.

The popish opinion declared and confuted.

postle hath declared when heeſaid: The bread which we breake. Is it not the cõ-
1.Corinth.10.16 municating of the bodie of Chriſt? And the word (cup) added in the other member or part of the inſtitution of the ſupper, doth plainlie prooue to all men that are not vterlie contentious, that this word (this) is as much, as if Chriſt ſhuld ſay this bread. And heere I confeſſe there is no trope at all, the reaſon is becauſe it was needfull for vs to haue the ſigne properlie & fullie declared, that we might not be deceiued.

Vbiquitaries, or conſubſtantiators, and thier opinions decla. red & confuted.

But our aduerſaries (among whom alſo a trope is almoſt as odious as an hereſie) being demanded, What anſwer they? Vertlie that vnder this Pronoune *Hoc*, that is, This, there is ſet out vnto vs, both ỹ bread and the bodie alſo, that is to ſay, both the ſigne & the thing ſignified, being in verie deed & eſſentiallie vnited togither, as they ſay. But (as erewhile I ſaid) 1 Paule vſeth the onelie word bread, and certeine it is, that that was ſhewed, whiche Chriſte took & brake. Shall 2 we ſay, that he took and brake his owne bodie? Certeinelie if they will ſo affirme, this reall coniunction of the ſignes & the thing ſignified, ſhall 3 not depend vpon the words of inſtitution,

Their opinion is contrarie
1 To ſcripture,
2 To the nature of Chriſts body.
3 To their owne opinions.

on,

on, seeing that euen before that Christ tooke it and brake it, it was not bread onlie, but his bodie also. Wherefore they must of necessity confes, that these words: This is my bodie, & these againe: This bread is my bodie, meane and signifie all one thing: which not onlie all the ancient fathers do affirme, in innumerable places, but Luther in manie places, and Brentius also, both in his booke called Syntagma, and in his catechisme likewise, yea Seluericus & Eberus, doo as it were in so manie words testifie also this truth. If yet notwithstanding they will haue euen the bodie vnited to the bread, to be shewed out thereby. I answer they must of necessitie then admit the trope or figure Synecdoche, and that therefore the institution of Christ, or the words of the institution, can not be vnderstood without a trope or figure. And what man that is in his right wits shall they persuade, that the word bodie can at one & the selfe same time be spoken of the bread & of the bodie without another Synedoche also. And this you see what they haue gained, who thinke it, and publish it in others to be a horrible heresie by a trope or figure to vnderstand ỹ words

Luther. Brentius.

Seluericus. Eberus.

He proueth the aduersaries to fall into that which they dislike in others.

of the supper, whereas they themselues are inforced and found out, to make a double trope or figure. Now let vs come to the word *Est*, that is to say, Is. Seeing that whatsoeuer is, is not after one sort (for to be, hath place in all the predicaments) when these men from hence gather thus, or doo after this sort expound these words, This bread is Christs bodie, therfore it is essentiallie Christes bodie, doo they not I beseech you speake as if they should say: This is a liuing creature: therfore it is a man? And againe, doo they reason lesse fondlie, when they gather thus: This bread is Christs bodie, therfore this bread is Christs bodie, not absent but present? Now, whereas they say, that the word bodie, because it is a substance, cannot be otherwise spoken or vttered, than substantiallie, I say they should haue left this to the papists, who are therefore inforced to bring in their transubstantiation of the bread, because they say, that things sundered or separated one of them from another, could not be spoken one of another (& that therfore also this propositiõ was false, the bread is the bodie) except they granted either that ỹ bread it selfe became nothing,

The word Est, is expounded.

or

or by changing were tourned into a substance of another sort, to wit, the substance of his body. Therfore these men alone do keep or vrge, & that most fondlie, the bare worde or letter. But these men of whom I now speake, though in outward shewe and speech, they refuse all tropes and figures, in the exposition of these words of the institution, doo yet notwithstanding ouer and besides the two tropes aboue mentioned, that is to say, the figure Synecdoche diuersly vsed in deede bring in an other, and that same very strange and woonderfull: when they will haue this speech: this bread is my bodie, to signifie and meane as much, as if Christ shoulde haue saide: my bodie is verily present, with, or in, or vnder this bread. Concerning which, this is my minde, that whosoeuer hee is that vseth this last forme or manner of speaking dooth not shew, what the bodie it selfe is, but rather declareth where the body is, and therefore vseth the worde (is) not in the predicament of substance, but in the predicament of Site as they call it.

Vbiquitaries, by vrging the bare letter, as absurd as Papists at the least.

The aduersaries by power of trueth constrained to fall into three tropes in the exposition of a fewe words, though otherwise the name be odious to them.

Nowe I come to speake of that worde Body. The thing that about this matter

The word Body handled.

The aduersaries charge.

is laide vnto our charge, is this, that in-stead of the true bodie of Christ, deliue-red to death for vs, wee substitute and place, I can not tell what typicall or fi-guratiue, or as it pleaseth them to call it, fantasticall bodie, when wee affirme that the bodie is spoken of the bread, not that the bread is the very bodie it selfe, but because it is as a signe and pledge of that true body of his, which was giuen for vs.

The answere thereto.

But is this to ascribe vnto Christ, a fained body, as these men slaunder vs? Or is it not rather rightly to declare and shew in what sense, that true and onelie bodie may bee laide or spoken of the bread, to wit, not as it is bread, but in as much as it is a sacrament of that his bodie? Ther-fore all these interpretations following, which that stincking slanderer Illyricus tosseth too and fro, as if they were contrary one of them to another, that is to saye: This bread sacramentally signifieth, or sacramentallye is Christes bodie: or a-gaine: This bread is the sacrament of Christes bodie, doo in deede and trueth, and altogether expresse but one and the selfe-same iudgement and matter.

Illyricus and his slaunders.

Nowe

Now that the worde bodie is in many places vsed, by all the old right beleeuing writers, for the verie signe of the bodie, our aduersaries must of necessitie whether they will or no, confesse, sith that they feare not to affirme, that Christes bodye is made, broken, consumed, and why shoulde it not bee so likewise, when it is saide, to enter into the mouth: To be short, what strife and stubbornesse is this of theirs: They dare not denie the bread to be the sacrament of Christes body: and why then will they not allowe of this interpretation: Heere is the reason forsooth, because they woulde haue it called the Sacrament of the bodie present.

All the auntient Fathers vse the worde bodie, for the signe of the bodie.

Then ẏ controuersie shal not be, yet touching the interpretation and meaning of these wordes of the institution, in which there is no mention at all, neither of presence nor absence, but herein onelie shall they consist, whether that bodie (of which that bread is saide to be the Sacrament) be absent or present: which controuersie, I can not so much as suppose howe these men should determine out of these wordes This is my bodie.

The state of the controuersie or question, is not about the interpretation of the wordes of institution, but about the presence of Christes bodie.

Hitherto

The second part of the Lords supper, to wit, the institution of the cup, and what is meant thereby.

Hitherto wee haue spoken of the first part of the Lords supper, to wit, the bread: but now let vs come to the other part, to wit, the cuppe. But tell vs (I pray you) what wee must vnderstande by the woord cup? Uerily, by their confession, euen that which is contained in the cuppe, that is to say, the wine, and yet ouer and besides that, the bloud of Christ, as they will needes haue it. The former of these I grant, to wit, that by the cuppe should be meant, the wine contained in the cup: but the latter I denie, to wit, that that wine should be in substance the very bloud of Christ, and this I do deny standing vpon the reasons, which I haue before spoken and alleaged. But howsoeuer it be, whether there be meant therby this wine alone, or together with the wine, euen the bloud it selfe: yet needes must these deadly enimies of tropes and figures acknowledge one figure here, to wit, a Metonomia, of the thing containing for the thing contained, yea, and that same verie trope of the same figure Synecdoche, (which wee haue spoken of before) whereby it commeth to passe, that the wine and the bloud are saide to be the bloud.

Now

Now then let them tel me how, without a trope or figure, that shall be counted the couenant it selfe, by meanes whereof the couenant is established: And yet this further I would gladly demaund of them, if the bare word or letter being so precisely obserued, that reall consubstantiation must of necessity ensue, how it can be that this should not followe likewise, that the signes beeing not onely distincted, but in very deede and truth separated and sundred also the body it selfe shoulde not likewise in deede bee separated and sundered from the blood? I many times thinking, and that earnestly of this one matter, to wit, why diuers did so greatly vrge this same rule Consubstantiation, euen as if it were the principall point of all our religion: of a truth, nothing could come into my minde but that which was most easie to be confuted. As for y that they say, that vnles Christs very body and his very blood be beleeued to be so present, that it may be receiued with the hands and with the mouth, or elle the bread and the wine, shall be but emptie and void signes, I say it is of no force. In good sooth, suppose yee that yee speake the trueth? Belike then

See for the proofe of this, Genesis 17.9.

Consubstantiation erronious, and al that is obiected for it most weake.

An obiection.

The answeare taken from an absurditie.

then all the sacraments that the Fathers had, before that Christs flesh was indeede created were voide, and of no force. Their Sacraments (saith Augustine) were in signes diuers, but in matter equall. But in what matter were they equall? Euen in Christ, the only matter of the sacraments: for that same spirituall word, that is, (as

Auguſt. in psa. 77

the selfe-same writer vpon the 77. psalme expounded it) signifieng some spirituall thing, was Christ; & they did eat the same

1. Corinth. 10.

meat that we eat, and did drinke the same drinke, to wit, Christ that was to be borne, as we eat and drinke Christ already borne, who is a spirituall meat and drinke. How vntrue therefore is it that the signes are of no force, except the thing signified, being in deede also present bee coupled and ioyned with the signe? Yea shall we say, that the water of Baptisme, is an idle signe? & yet I neuer hard of any man that would say, that the bloud of Christ was indeede consubstantiated together with the wine. But against this they replie saieng: the reason or cause of that is, because the Lord saide not, that that water was his bloud. Let vs grant that, and yet in the meane while wee haue gained this,

2

A second reson, standing vpon comparison of the element of baptisme, with the elements of the supper.

that

that y Sacrament is not abolished, or made of no force, though the signe bee in one place, and the thing signified thereby bee in an other, so that both of them be truly offered and giuen. And this much, or hitherto haue we spoken of this third point, that is to say, of the sacramentall coniunction or ioyning of the signe with the thing signified.

The summe of that which hath bin saide, touching the sacramental coniunction of the signe and the thing signified.

Now the summe of this true and right beleeuing iudgement is this, to wit, that that is a sacramentall coniunction, whereby it commeth to passe, that through gods ordinance, that which is signified by the signes vsed, though nowe it be neuer so farre from vs (I meane Christ himselfe, as in respect of his flesh) is yet notwithstanding, through the power of the holie ghost, but yet in suche a spirituall sorte and maner, as wee shall declare hereafter, as trulely and verily offered vnto vs, and giuen vs, to be enioyed of vs as verily as the signes themselues are looked vpon wyth the eies, touched with the handes and receiued and perceiued also wyth the mouth.

But let vs now come at the length, to the fourth or last question and point, to wit,

The fourth or last part of this discourse.

wit, what manner of taking or receiuing there is, both of the signs themselues, and of the thing signified. Concerning the taking or receiuing of the signs, there is no controuersie or doubt made of it, but that it is naturall and outward, because it is manifestly and plainely performed of all them that come vnto it, by bodily instruments and meanes. But as for the things signified, to wit, that very flesh of Christ, and that very bloud of his, they are so receiued and taken, euen as they are present and offered. But they are present and offered also, to our mind and faith, because they are nowe (as wee haue saide) not on earth, but in heauen: and therefore they can not bee taken or receiued otherwise than by our minds and faith. Augustine also speaking well and rightly touching this point, after this manner: Why preparest thou thy mouth and bellie? This foode belongeth not to the bellie, but to the minde: Beleeue and thou hast eaten: Whereupon also this likewise followeth, that all that come to the Lordes table (as the same Augustine saith) receue the body of the lord, that is to say, the sacrament of the Lordes body, to wit, the bread vsed at

A syllogisme.

The maior.

The minor.

The conclusion.

Augustine.

Augustine.

the

may be one, euen as thou and I are one

And in one worde, as you would say to finish the matter: if onelie the members of Christ are to be saued, then they must needes confesse, that wee are thorowe faith truelye graffed into Christ, and that euen before wee come to the supper: in so muche as, no manne can rightlye and orderlye come to the supper, which is not nowe already, both in baptisme, and in the worde, become a member of Christe, and therefore is vnited with Christe him selfe. And yet it dooeth not hereevppon followe, that the institution of the Supper is superfluous, by which wee doo not indeede at the first pusshe, but yet notwithstanding in processe of time, doo growe vppe more and more in Christ. For him that wee doo alreadye possesse, must wee yet still dayly seeke: and the more in number or strength that the obiectes of our faith, so muche the more meete is, that that meane measure of faith that wee haue, beeing stirred vppe in vs, it shoulde become so muche the more effectuall and powerfull.

That followeth not, that the aduersaries fantasie.

For else what doo these men gather

which wee may not, euen from the very first institution and celebration of the Lords supper, as safly collect against the repetition or often administration of the same: For certainely if we conclude, that the Lords supper is therfore superfluous, because we receiue nothing therein, but that which wee receiued before, in the worde and baptisme, then this also will followe therevppon, that it is altogether vnprofitable, to repaire the second or third time to the Lords supper, seeing that hee that commeth thither the seconde or sundry times, receiueth nothing more than that very selfe-same thing, which before hee had laide holde of and receiued, than when he came first thereto. But they say, there is giuen to all that come thither, not bread alone, but that bread which is the sacrament: otherwise Christs words shold be frustrate saying: This is my bodie. I grant all this, and yet I deny the consequece. Both things, that is, the signe, and the thing signified, is giuen or offered to all: therefore all receiue both. This hangeth not together: for two things are offered, one to the body, the other to the minde: the one is to bee taken holde of by the

A reason of the assertion.

The seeond obiection, with the answere therto.

As man standeth of two parts: so accordingly two things are offered in the supper.

the meane of the body, either to life or to death: the other is to bee apprehended by faith, and yet but to life onelie. Is it any maruell then that two thinges beeing to bee receiued by seuerall instrumentes and meanes, though perhappes they bee both offered in one action, as they saye, the one of them should be receiued, by euery one that bringeth the common instrument of the body: and the other apprehended but of them alone that bring wyth them that same spirituall and onelie fit instrument to apprehend Christ by? No verilye. And yet heere againe I pray you marke, howe great the strength of trueth is.

Those that contend so stiffely, and that also wythout any profit to the church about vnwoorthie communicants (for to what ende shoulde wee trauaile so muche about them?) Doo notwithstanding distinguish, betweene such vnwoorthie persons as liue not christianlie enough, or otherwise are not sufficiently prepared for receiuing of the supper (yet so as they feare not to affirme, that euen they also eate Christes flesh, though it be to their destruction vnlesse they repent) and such

A distinction voide of reason and religion.

as are altogether the wicked and vnbeleeuers, who receiue nothing but the bare signes.

But if that same reall Consubstantiation which they fantasie bee true, then this will ensue thereupon, that not onelie all reasonable creatures without exception, receiuing the signs, but the very beasts (let there bee reuerence in hearing this that I nowe say, and let not any manne take it, as though I spake blasphemously) eating that bread and drinking that wine, shall haue receiued also the flesh and the bloud of Christ. But they except further against this truth, that the vnworthy are saide to be guiltie of the Lordes body and bloud. Wee graunt that too, Is it because they did vnwoorthily receiue the body and bloud? No in deede: But because they did eate vnwoorthily of that bread, and drincke vnwoorthilye of that cuppe: or, because they discerned not the Lordes body, for that same vnwoorthie vsing and receiuing of the holy signes or pledges redoundeth vnto the contempt of the thing signified and offered, euen as he may iustly be accounted guiltie of some crime: yea, of treason if you will against the

A warie, but yet withall, a most necessarie caution.

An obiection answered.

1. Corinth. 11. 27

1. Cor. 11. 28, 29.

A fit similitude.

the Emperoures Maiestie, that in contempt or reprochfullye dooth violate the Emperours picture or image. Wee see then, that the wicked are become guiltye of the body and bloud of Christe, not that they haue receiued them (vnlesse a man will take the body for the signe of the bodye, which is oftentimes vsed in the antient Fathers) but because they haue thorowe their vnbeleefe reiected or refused them. For Christ him selfe can neuer be sundered from that his quickening power, wherefore looke of whom soeuer hee is receiued (nowe indeede hee is receiued onely of the beleeuers) they must of necessitye bee deliuered from eternall death, as he himself plainelie beareth witnesse.

Christ and his graces are neuer sundered.

Iohn. 5. 24.

Nowe whereas these men except against this trueth, that christ is deliuered to some for iudgement, and that thorowe the very fault of the hearers. We grant that also, but yet so, if in respect as Christ is thorowe their vnbeleefe refused, and cast from them, and not receiued of them by faith.

An obiection shortlie answered.

Lastly, whereas these men suppose, that Christ him selfe can not bee truely par-

The last obiection, with the answere therto.

The last obiection, with the aunsweare thereto.

taken, vnlesse hee be indeede apprehended both by the handes and mouth also, and that therefore we holde a communicating not of Christ himselfe, but of his efficacie and power, let vs a little consider this falshoode, and weigh this slaunder. First therefore we must knowe, that when we remoue a bodily eating, that so wee may establishe a spirituall and mysticall eating: that both these must bee vnderstoode not of the thing it selfe which is communicated or partaken, but of the maner of communicating or partaking. For neither did Christ himselfe say: This is the merite or benefite of my death: but this is that my body, which is giuen for you: neyther doo wee suppose, that Christ himselfe can be lesse vnskilfully separated from his efficacie, when the question is of Spirituall nourishement, than if a manne woulde denie, that we had neede to eate bread it selfe, and drincke wine it selfe, that so afterwardes wee might drawe or fetch bodily nourishment from the same.

Luke 22.19.

A similitude.

But wee saye and affirme, that this manner of communicating or partaking, is not bodilie, neither yet that it can be perfor-

perfourmed by bodilie instruments, or meanes, but altogether spirituall and mysticall, as which is perfourmed by faith alone, which faith imbraceth that matter, that is offered vnto vs in the word and sacraments. But if they will denie that this can be perfourmed, because of such a great distance of places, let them then cease at the last to accuse vs of vngodlinesse, as though we would either denie Gods almightie power, or giue sentence touching this mysterie, by the rules of worldlie philosophie. And yet we will not denie, but that this obiection may then haue some place, if by communicating or partaking we vnderstand a reall appliyng or mixture of Christes bodie with ours, whether it be of the whole with the whole, or of the parts with the parts, that so the church might in deed be a bodie, as it were souldered and glewed togither of innumerable bodies of beleeuers, being indeed molten togither as it were with Christes bodie. But fie vpon this monster, and let vs learne alwaies to driue it far from vs: for who perceiueth not that the bodie arising or flowing from this felowship or communicating and belonging altogether to a

Faith alone imbraceth the words and sacraments & all the graces offered vs therein.

If absurdities or errors be yeelded vnto, then they will be infinit, & no measure of them.

spirituall life, is mysticall: Wherfore we are truelie, but yet after a spirituall sort and mysticallie, become one with Christ himselfe through faith, that so from him there may flow into vs true life. And euen as these our members being naturallie ioined with the soule, doo receiue from it sence and moouing: so should we after a spirituall and vndeclarable maner (for great is the mysterie of that spirituall mariage, that is betweene Christ and his church, as the apostle largelie and lowdlie declareth) liue in Christ, being ledde and gouerned by his spirit, and he againe manifest and declare his powerfull working in vs. Now tell me, is this the abolishing of that partaking that wee haue with Christ himselfe, or doo we not rather make it a diuine and heauenlie partaking? But if with these men we would make it a cõmunicating with the mouth, then this partaking or communicating should be no woonderful or excellent matter. For what I pray you is more naturall and vsuall, than if anie thing that is in deed present, be deliuered vs to eat, we take it in our hands, and swallow it down thorow our mouth? But that we, though as

A similitude.

Ephes. 5. 32.

We cannot approoue of a bodilie communicating or partaking with the mouth, because that were to spoile our faith, and rob God of his almightie power & truth.

as now poore wretches we be placed on the earth, & not els where, should notwithstanding, truelie and in deed become the verie members of the flesh and bloud of Christ himselfe, who now according to his flesh remaineth in heauen, and no where else, and should fetch from thence the verie iuice in deed of eternall life, notwithstanding that woonderfull great distance of place that is betweene him and vs, this I say passeth all mans vnderstanding, and is a most euident testimonie both of Gods truth, and also of his almightie power.

And let this suffice also for answer to these slanderers, who crie out, that wee transforme this holie mysterie into an imaginarie ghost or conceit, in that we do attribute all this wholie to our mindes & faith: for if they doo trulie conclude this against vs, what remaineth then, but that we affirme likewise the baptisme of christians to be a certeine vaine fantasie or apparition, and their saluation also to be in imagination, and not in truth, who die before they can come to be present at, or partakers of the Lords supper? Now if naturall vnderstanding it selfe and apprehension

If the aduersaries conclusion be true, then there will insue thereupon two grosse errors.

1

2

Two similitudes conteining in them arguments from the lesse to the more.

1

henſion be ſo powerfull and effectuall, that we being holpē by theſe faculties become ſkilfull in ſo manie things, ſhall not faith that excellent gift of the Holie ghoſt, worke this in vs, that wee ſhall through faith trulie and in deed apprehend & take hold of that verie thing, which God offereth vs, to be receiued by faith, though it be neuer ſo far remooued from vs: And ſith by the heat of the ſun, though it be neuer ſo far diſtant from vs, the whole world is after a ſort quickened and made liuelie and ſtrong, ſhall not Chriſt be able, though his fleſh and his bloud remaine in heauen, ſo to become in deed our myſticall head, that he may powre into vs the iuice of eternall life? But of theſe matters wee haue ſpoken thus far. My purpoſe was (brethren) largelie to diſcourſe of theſe points, becauſe of the ſlanders of certeine ilwillers, that ſo by this meanes, the true and ſound doctrine of our churches, being made knowne, none of them that repaire to this church ſhuld refuſe our aſſemblies, ſpeciallie the holie ſupper which we mind God willing, within few dates to adminiſter, but rather that we ſhould euery one of vs religiouſlie celebrate this holie banket,

The concluſion of all.

ket, earnestlie intreating the Lord to restreine troublesome spirits, to confirme right beleeuers, and (to be short) to grant vs all this grace, that being of one minde in him, we may in this world lead an innocent and vnblamable life, and at the last be receiued into eternall life and blessednesse, by our Lord Iesus Christ: to whom with the Father, and the Holie ghost, be all praise, and glorie for euer and euer: So be it.

A godlie praier.

A SHORT SVMME OF sound doctrine, touching the *matter of the Sacrament of* the Lords supper.

By Thomas Wilcocks.

Foure things to be speciallie regarded in Christ,

We haue to consider in Christ our onely Mediatour, especiallie fowre things, that is to saie:

1. *Christes person.*
2. *His office.*
3. *The gifts & graces which we receiue from him.*
4. *Lastlie, by what meanes wee are made partakers of those gifts.*

1. *Concerning Christes person.*

Christ consisting of two natures, is yet but one person.

WE teach & affirme, that Christ dooth consist of two natures, the one the nature of God, the other the nature of man, making yet notwithstanding but one person of both natures: and that so also as the proprieties both in the nature of God, and also of man, remaine safe and sound, and are rightlie distinguished one of them from another. And though we confesse the mans nature of Christ to be glorified, and that in the cheefest de-

Wherein the glorification of Christes bodie standeth.

gree

one, and that no lesse truelie and straitlie than the members are ioined to a naturall body, but yet in that maner, and after that sort, which we will hereafter declare. Neither do they please, satisfie, or content vs, wherfore this our ioining with Christ vnto that great mysterie of his incarnation: for this is a generall communicating or partaking of his nature with ours: but heere we intreat of a particular or peculiar coniunction, by which it commeth to passe, that his church and congregation groweth vp togither with him. And we affirme this coniunction and ioining of vs togither, to be the welspring of all the benefits which afterwards are conueied ouer from Christ vnto vs: for seeing that the father is well pleased in him alone, it is meet that we be truelie made one with him, that in him also we may please the father. Hence then insueth another sort of giftes and graces, that is to say, such as when we haue Christ giuen vs, are thē in and with him also bestowed vpon vs. Of which there are likewise two speciall sorts: First, the imputation or accoūting vnto vs of Christs holinesse, righteousnes, & obedience, that so in him we may be the

Ephes. 4. 13.

Matth. 3. 17. Iohn. 17. 11.

Christ and his graces cannot be sundered.

Two sorts of graces in Christ.

righteousnes of God, through the forgiuenesse of our sinnes. Secondlie a spirituall life it selfe, flowing vnto vs his members, from the flesh of Christ God and man, by the force and power whereof we are new borne, and nourished into euerlasting life, euen as by meat and drinke this fraile life is fostred and mainteined in vs.

4 *How Christ togither with his gifts and graces may be receiued of vs.*

What the Holie ghost is.

That we receiue Christ togither with all his gifts and graces, this must be attributed, as we freelie confesse, to the free working of the Holie spirit alone, which is the essentiall power of the father and the sonne: for he alone maketh vs meet to vnderstand these things which are of God, yea and that in such sort, that we doo not onelie confesse all Gods promises generallie to be true, but also euerie one of vs in our hearts doo certeinelie persuade our selues that these promises doo belong vnto vs, and therefore may with boldnesse crie Abba, O father. This same most excellent worke of the Holie ghost we call faith, which is the free gift of GOD, alotted speciallie to the elect, and

1.Cor.2.13.14.

What faith is.

Rom.8.15. Galath.4.6.

Ephes.2.8.

and is as in respect of vs, the onelie fit and meet instrument to perceiue Christ by, and to receiue all his graces. Therefore we teach with Paule, that we are iustified and saued by faith alone: we meaning thereby nothing else but this, that by that onelie instrument of faith, wee lay holde vpon all thinges necessarie to saluation; to wit, Christ with all his giftes. Furthermore, the Holie ghost, to the end that this faith may be begotten in vs by his secret power, as also for the fostering and strengthening thereof, after that it is wrought, doeth vse likewise outward meanes (because wee consist of a rude and grosse nature) to wit, the worde written and preached, which hee by his power maketh effectuall in vs, that so he may worke in vs these thinges of which wee haue before spoken. And this word sometime is simple, and by it selfe or alone, as you would saye, not accompanied with other, of whiche sort is the dailie preaching of the same woorde. And sometimes againe it hath visible signes ioyned to it, together with certeine ceremonies: which signes the Greekes call mysteries,

Rom. 3. 28.

The outward meanes of faith.

The word considered two waies, to wit, as it is preached without the sacraments, and as the sacraments are annexed thereto.

and the Latines sacraments: for God verilie regarding our weakneſſe, went to assure vs of that his goodwill towards vs, not by the eares onelie, but also by other sences, and so more and more to establish and seale vnto vs our coniunction with Christ his sonne. These things being put downe, and these ground-works and founcions laid, it shalbe an easie matter to gather our mind touching the questions following, which respect or concerne the matter of the sacrament.

Q 1 Wherfore and to what purpose are sacraments ordeined?

Sacraments ordeined to three ends.

A First, that we might so much ỹ more effectuallie possesse Christ himselfe. 1
Secondlie, that look how much ỹ more strait our growing vp with Christ himselfe is, so much more and more should that life of Christ bee deriued and conueied ouer vnto vs, with other his gifts and graces. 2
Thirdlie, that we might so much ỹ more effectuallie remember, that holie loue, which ought to be of force amongst such as are members of the same bodie, and to which loue we by solemne protestation bind our selues as it were. 3

Q 2 From

Q. 2 From whence floweth that force of the sacraments?

A Wholie and altogither from the working of the Holie ghost, and not from the signes, otherwise than as by these outward obiects, the inward sences are mooued. And the Holie ghost vsing those meanes & aids for our infirmities sake, dooth make these motions effectuall and powerfull, in what measure, and at what time soeuer it pleaseth him.

The force of the sacraments is from the Holie ghost onelie.

Q. 3 Which is the formall cause of the sacraments?

A The ordinance of God conteined in his word, and set out or declared by his minister, according to his commandement, and not the bare pronunciation of those same words, nor any force lieng hid in the words themselues.

The formall cause of the sacraments.

Q. 4 What is the power of this formall cause?

A That the signes not in their verie nature or substance, but as in respect of their vse onelie should be changed, & that so long as the action whervnto they serue, is of force or in hand. For in the holy mysteries we esteeme not water, as water simplie, or bread as bread alone, or wine

The elements are changed in the sacrament, but that is in respect of vse onelie, and not of substance.

as wine onelie, but as certeine signes, and true pledges of those thinges which the Lord, though in another manner in deed (as we shall by and by declare) yet notwithstanding most certeinlie and truelie dooth giue vnto vs, that is to say, of Christ himselfe, with all his giftes and graces.

The matter of the sacraments is two fold.

Q. 5 What is the matter of the sacraments?

The outward matter are the elements.

A The outward matter we count the signes themselues, to wit, water in baptisme, bread and wine in the Lords supper, together with the ceremonies ordeined by Christ, as his word testifieth, which also themselues doo truelie signifie matters of great weight, and altogither heauenlie. We haue alreadie often times said, that not that onelie is termed of vs, the inward matter, or matter it selfe of the sacrament, whatsoeuer is deriued to vs from Christ, but principallie Christ himselfe, with whom it is meet that we be made one, before we can draw or fetch anie thing from him. And in deed in baptisme there is set out vnto vs the true and verie bloud of the Lord, as a lauer or fountaine, with which bloud being washed.

Christ and his graces are the inward matter.

Baptisme what it signifieth.

shed, we are more and more ingrafted into Christ, and buried with him. And in the supper, the bodie and bloud of the same Christ is giuen to vs, and that in seuerall signes, as our true meat, and true drinke into life euerlasting. There is then one inward matter of the word alone, or by it selfe, and the sacraments also, annected thereto, that is to say, Christ himselfe, with all his benefits, to the partaking whereof we are called. But notwithstanding some difference there is, to wit, according to more and lesse, as they vsuallie say in schooles. First, because that when the sacraments are ioined to the simple word or word alone, then it necessarilie followeth, that there is a more plentifull declaration of Gods good will towards vs, and looke by how much there are more obiects in number, and they likewise more euident, by so much the more vehementlie or earnestlie they doo moue and stirre vs vp, or at least wise ought so to doo. Secondlie, because although the worde alone propounded generallie vnto all, bee afterwardes by the power of faith, applied vnto euerie particular faithfull person: yet this is not there

The supper what it signifieth.

Christ offered in the word and in the sacraments, but yet in two respects more liuelie & plainlie in the sacraments.

The first difference.

The second difference.

so plainelie and particularlie expressed, as in the sacraments in which Christ is verilie offered particularlie and seuerallie to euerie one: wherby it commeth to passe that euerie particular beleeuer is after a certeine maner put into the possession of Christ himselfe.

Q. 6 How is the matter ioined with the signes?

The signes and the things signified are ioined sacramentallie.

A By a sacramentall maner which seeing it is proper & peculiar to them alone, must be declared by a proper definition, & such a one as is fit for that purpose, we therefore define or determine, that the sacramentall maner of ioining the matter with the signes, is spirituall: by which epitheton or word, we conceiue no imagined or feined thing, but principally meane that it specially dependeth of the power of the Holie ghost, as we haue alreadie said in the declaration of the formall cause. Moreouer, by that meanes we shut out all grosse and naturall maner of ioining: for as we know that the signs are vpon earth, & not else where, which thing also no man can or will denie: so also we hold and conclude, that the matter it selfe, that is to say, Christ himselfe, according to his

Why it is called a spirituall coniunction.

A similitude.

flesh, is contained in heauen, and not in anye other place, as wee gather out of the Scriptures, and all the Fathers of right faith and sound iudgement. And yet wee doubt not but that the signes are ioyned with the matter, that is to say, in that respect, or so farre foorth as God, dooth not onlie, as it were a far off shew, the signs of the bodie and bloud of Christ: but beside the very signes, doth also truely giue vnto vs Christ himselfe, to be enioyed and possessed of vs. Whereby also it commeth to passe, that in this respect aboue mentioned, these things may be truely saide to be ioyned together, although by spaces of places they are separated far and wide asunder. Notwithstanding we holde, that this coniunction is true and certaine, in so much as, that therefore the name of the thing it selfe, that is, I saye, the body and bloud is indeede figuratiuely, but yet verie significantly and plainely giuen to the very signes, to wit, vnto the bread and the wine. Secondly, to the ende wee maye more fully declare this sacramentall maner of ioyning the matter with the signe, wee adde, that it is significatiue, not as though God did onely signifie vnto vs in

Luke 24.51.
Actes 3.21.
Roman.8.34.
Coloss.3.1.

The sacramentall coniunction is true and sure.

What is called a significatiue coniunction.

the Sacramentes, the body and bloud of hys Sonne, and also his Sonne hymselfe (for no doubt but that also hee dooth truelie giue him vnto vs) but wee doo it to this ende, least anye man shoulde thinke the matter to bee so coupled with the signes, that Christs flesh also shoulde nowe be present in earth, though it were after a certaine inuisible and incomprehensible maner. Wee say therefore, that Christes bodie and bloud, is by so great a space absent from the signes, euen as the earth it selfe, is distant from the most high Heauens, or from the seate of the blessed (touching which wee minde not at any time ouer curiously to dispute or discourse) and into which we knowe and beleeue that Christ ascended, that so in all our behalfes, and for vs indeede, he might obtaine and get that same immortal inheritance. Notwithstanding we separat not the thing from the signs, either as in respect of God, who truely offereth both the one and the other, or as in respect of the faithfull, who truelie and indeede receiue both. But we note the difference of place in the coniunction of the thing, and the signes, that the trueth of Christes flesh,

Curiositie to be auoided, specially in things we are not skilled in.

Things must be so ioyned that neither they nor other must be confounded or iumbled together.

and

and of his aſcenſion, may be preſerued ſafe and ſounde: neither yet do we for al that, by any meanes make void the Lords ſupper it ſelfe.

Q 7 What is to be thought of theſe manner of ſpeeches: The bodie of the Lord is in, or with, or vnder the bread, or nigh vnto the bread, and of all, or any other that be of the like ſort?

A As yet wee feare to vſe theſe, or ſuche like manner of ſpeaches, becauſe they ſeeme to take awaye the diſtaunce of places, which wee neceſſarilie eſtabliſhe and allowe: or elſe they vpholde the vbiquitie of Chriſtes bodie, which we mate not graunt at any hand, although we confeſſe, that beſides the ſignes, the thing it ſelfe is offered vs of GOD, and by the faithfull truely receiued, but after that maner which we will declare in the tenth queſtion. Notwithſtanding it ſhold ſeeme, that theſe termes (which are vnder) for concordes ſake may be admitted, but not vnleſſe a plaine and manifeſt interpretation be ioyned withall: to wit, that theſe particles are ſo to bee vnderſtoode, not as though Chriſts fleſh ſhoulde be placed vppon earth, but that we may knowe, that beſides

Two cauſes why theſe kindes of ſpeeches are not to be allowed.
1
2

A chriſtian yeelding, for peace ſake, but yet with good cautions and exceptions.

beſides the ſignes themſelues which are vppon the earth, Chriſt himſelfe whiche is in heauen, is truely giuen vnto vs, as the ſignes on earth doo beare witnes.

Q 8 What ought we to iudge of this manner of ſayeng, Chriſt is preſent in the ſupper, corporallie, reallie, ſubſtantiallie?

A For the ſelfe-ſame cauſe before alleadged, wee doo not vſe theſe formes of ſpeech neither notwithſtanding it ſhould ſeeme, that they alſo might bee tollerated or borne withal, ſo that we adde the interpretation following, to witte, that theſe things doo not pertaine to that manner of coniunction, wherby the thing is ioyned with the ſignes, but ſerue rather to expreſſe and declare the matter it ſelfe, that is to ſay, that ſo wee may vnderſtand, that by the action of the ſupper, there is eſtabliſhed and confirmed in vs, not onlie the vertue and power of Chriſt, but chiefly, our very growing vp with chriſt himſelf, from which we haue affirmed the ſame to flowe, euen as it were, from a fountaine, becauſe afterwardes wee fetch from him, both true life, and alſo all thinges neceſſarie to ſaluation. Neither would I iudge

Hard ſpeeches with ſome qualifications and interpretations may be tollerated for a time.

This is the lawe of righteouſnes; to haue that doone to our ſelues that we woulde do to others.

it

ſt to be refuſed, that a like interpretation may againe be ioyned to this our manner of ſpeaking, that Chriſt is ſpirituallie in the ſupper, leaſt any man ſhoulde thinke that we ſeparate Chriſts power from the very fleſh of Chriſt, or imagine vnto him a ſpeciall bodie.

Q. 9 What is to bee iudged of this manner of ſayeng: That Chriſt is preſent in the ſupper, and is diſtributed alſo, by an incomprehenſible manner, or after a ſorte, that can not bee vnderſtoode?

A We vſe this manner of ſpeech, but yet in a far other ſenſe and meaning than ſome are woonte. For (vnleſſe peraduenture wee be deceiued) they ſeeme to take this ſaying after this ſort, as though by a certaine diuine and heauenlie power, by reaſon alſo of the perſonall vnion of the fleſh with the godhead Chriſts fleſh ſhould be really at one time and together, both in heauen and in earth. But, though we neither deny the omnipotencie of GOD: neither the true coniunction of the thing, with the ſignes, and of the faithfull with Chriſt himſelfe, we do yet not withſtanding, by reaſon of the truth of Chriſts fleſh, and

A corrupt interpretation.

A true interpretation.

and his ascension likewise plainly affirme that the body of Christ is nowe verily absent from the worlde, & shal remaine absent vntill he come to iudge the quick and the dead. Nuertheles we confes, this mysterie of god to be incomprehēsible & beyond our vnderstanding: whereby it falleth out, that that which is, and remaineth in heauen, & not el-where, that so we may draw life and saluation from him, who is trulie offered vnto vs, and in deede communicated of vs. For albeit wee knowe, first, that the Holie-ghost, that is to say, gods power doth worke this, and then that as in regarde of our selues, all this is to be receiued of vs, by the onelye instrument or meane of faith: yet the power of the spirit, and the force of faith, doo exceede all our vnderstanding: whereby it commeth to passe also, that euen this whole action is verie properly called, a mysterie or secret, as the Greeks vsed to terme it.

Acts 3. 21.

Faith ioyneth things together that be as farre asunder as heauen and earth.

The power of the spirite, and of the force of faith.

Q. 10 How is the matter or thing of the Sacrament communicated or partaken of vs?

A The matter of the Sacrament, that is to say, Christ himselfe, is receiued of vs, by a spirituall manner, thorow faith.

And

And wee call that a Spirituall manner of receiuing or communicating, not onelie in which Chriſt his ſpirite is communicated with vs, but alſo, that which is not earthlie or naturall, but dependeth of the incomprehenſible power of the Holieghoſt, by which moſt ſtraight bond indeede the members are more and more ioyned wyth their head. For we exclude and ſhutte out, all powring abroade and mingling of ſubſtaunces, and alſo all fitneſſe of ioyning together of naturall partes, and yet can holde and maintaine a true growing vppe of the faithfull with Chriſt, which can not bee hindered by anie diſtaunce of places: for our faith cleaueth vnto the worde of God, who indeede performeth that which he promiſeth.

Spirituall receiuing what it is.

Q. 11 In what ſenſe are theſe ſpeeches (To eate the Lords body, and to drinke his bloud, and other ſuch like) to be admitted?

A We ſay, that theſe manner of ſpeeches do alſo belõg to that communicating or partaking, whereby wee laye holde of Chriſt, euen in the ſimple word, or in the worde it ſelfe alone: yea, wee affirme, that they are verye effectuall and ſignificant, but

Eating and drinking referred vnto Chriſts bodie and bloud muſt be figuratiuelie vnderſtoode.

but so, that the words of eating and drinking, when they are spoken of the taking of the body and bloud of Christ, are no lesse figuratiuely to be vnderstoode, than if a man should attribute to faith a mouth and teeth. Now we alleadge two chiefe causes why the holy-ghost speaketh after that manner: one cause is, that hee may shew, how strait our coniunction with christ is, by the meanes of faith: for nothing more groweth vp and increaseth with vs, than meate and drinke, without which no man can passe ouer his time, or spend this life: the other cause (which also properly hath place in the Sacraments) is, that by this way and meanes it may be declared, how true the Lorde is in deliuering the matter it selfe, which he promiseth by signes, as it were, by certaine pledges giuen: for thereby it commeth to passe, that though the onely signes are taken wyth the hand, and receiued wyth the mouth, yet that also which beside the signes, is truely offered, and by faith onely spiritually receiued, is said to be taken, eaten, drunken, &c: And for this cause we acknowledge, that the holie Fathers haue vsed manie other formes of speaking, not vnlike these, which we

Two causes why the holie-ghost vseth borrowed speeches.

The first.

The second.

Why we vse not the fathers phrases in the supper.

were notwithstanding will not at this day heedelesly vse, but suppose rather, that the same are to be mitigated by some profitable and fitte interpretations, and the rather, bicause of many errours spread abroade by Sathan, and many controuersies also by this occasion stirred vp in the church of God.

Q. 12. How are these wordes: This is my bodie, and this is my bloud, to bee expounded?

A. Euen after this maner: This, that is to say, this bread & this wine, is, to wit, sacramentally for not whatsoeuer is anie thing, is by one onely way a thing. Nowe the question is heere, concerning the Sacraments. And wee plainly say sacramentally, bicause the Lorde did indeede offer, not bare bread and wine only, but the true signes of his bodie and bloud, neither onely these signes, but besides them also, his body and bloud to be enioyed & possessed of vs, euen into euerlasting life, which life euerlasting also we drawe from him being communicated vnto vs. My body and my bloud, that is, not an imagined bodie or fained bloud, but that selfe-same body which was giuē for vs, and that self-same

The wordes of the institution expounded particularlie, and as it were, one after an other.

Luke 22.19,20.

bloud which was shead for vs, of both which wee are indeede by faith made partakers, as the signes doo truely witnes.

Q. What do the wicked or vnbeleeuers receiue?

The institution of the supper dependeth vpon Gods trueth.

A. We hold and teach, that by an agreeing iudgement and holy consent, that the institution of the sacrament doth hang vpon the trueth of God, & therefore that in the very action of the Lords supper rightlie administred, the bread is alwayes a true signe of the Lords body, and the wine a true signe of the Lords bloud, to whomsoeuer they be offered or giuen. Nowe, whereas some would thervpon gather and inferre, that al do receiue the whole sacrament, we can at no hand grant it, for this consequence or reason is not of force. God doth offer it to all, therefore al receiue it. But rather on the contrary side, we gather and reason this: God doth in the Sacrament offer two things, and that indeede as verilie and trulie the one, as the other, but both are to be receiued by meanes and instruments altogether diuers and different: that is to say, the outward signs are to be receiued bodily, and the thing it selfe spiritually by faith. Therefore because

A bad conclusion inuerted and cast vpon the aduersaries themselues.

euery

euery man bringeth his mouth, al receiue the outward signes, some indeede worthilie, and othersome vnworthilie: but because the faithful & beleeuers onelie bring the mouth of faith, therefore the faith all only receiue the matter it selfe, & therfore also life euerlasting. And the vnbeleeuers eate and drink iudgement to them selues, because they discerne not, that is to saye, despise and reiect the Lords bodie offered them, neyther haue they any regard therof. Wherefore this their condemnation proceedeth not, of the bodie and bloud of the Lorde vnworthily receiued (for seeing that they are not receiued but by faith, they are neuer receiued vnworthily, neither can they indeede bee otherwise than liuelie and quickening things) but of the body and bloud of the Lord, therefore contemned and reiected, because in this action, neither the bread should be duely considered as bread, but as a pledge of the lords body, nor the wine regarded onely as the wine, but as a sure pledge of the Lordes bloud. Therfore hence it commeth to pas, that whosoeuer bee he that receiueth this bread and wine vnworthily, that is to say, without faith, doth despise, not the bread,

The reason why some receiue woorthilie, other some vnworthilie.

1. Corinth. 11.

From whence the condemnation of the wicked floweth, in that they do vnwoorthily eate at the Lords table.

To receiue without faith, is to receiue vnworthilie.

and the wine: but the body & bloud of the Lord in those pledges, & is therfore guilty of the body & bloud of the Lord, which hee receiued not, but which he had in consideration or due regard of for Christ doth not quicken or cause to liue, al them to whom he is offered, whether this be doone in the word alone, or in the sacraments, but hee doth indeed quickē al them of whom he is receiued, because he cannot bee receiued of any other but of the faithfull only: & as for those of whom he is dispised, he doth iudge them al, so far off is it, that hee is of them receiued. Notwithstanding, for some of the fathers sakes, & the reuerence we carie them, me thinke that this saying (the body of Christ is of euery one receiued) might be born withall: & this also, that of ỹ faithfull it is receiued worthily to life, & of the vnfaithfull vnworthily to iudgement: but yet for all ỹ, we must of necessitie ad such an interpretation, as may shew this thing to be true, that is, so far forth, as the name of the thing signified, that is, of the body, is transferred or attributed to the signes themselues: so farre forth also, as by this speech they may be properly or fitly shewed forth, not what euery one receiueth,

A reason why all receiue not Christ in the supper.

Two sayings of the auncient fathers very charitably interpreted.

1
2

but

but what the Lorde of his owne goodnes offereth to euery one.

The conclusion.

The conclusion, consisting first of a wish, which hath two parts.

1

This is the summe of al those things, which are taught in our churches and congregations, concerning the matter of the sacrament, so far forth as I could euer obserue, gather, or learne. And the thing wee wish and desire is that, that men would so prouide for the churches peace and quietnes, that al manner of speeches not vsed in Scripture might bee auoided, so farre forth as coulde be. And againe, that if for doctrines sake, or the teaching of others, any thing shall be thought good to be changed, that then all ambiguitie and doubtfulnes might be remoued and taken away. But if any thing in this doctrine deliuered can be shewed or proued, not to be agreable to Gods word, we are readie, not onely to be taught and instructed, but also to thanke (as there is good cause) such as shall teach vs, that so at the length wee may wholie, and altogether thinke one thing in the Lorde, which (GOD is our witnes) we doo with al our heart day and night earnestlye desire of his mercifull goodnes.

2

Secondly, of a promise, which also hath two partes.

1

2

Μονῳ τῳ θεῳ δοξα.

The substance of the Lords supper, shortlie and soundlie sette forth, for the instruction and comfort of all true christian Readers.

TO cleare, yea, to void all the controuersies, that frō time to time haue crept into the church of Christ, concerning the matter of the lords supper, these three circumstances are meete especially to bee considered.

1. Corinth. 11. 23 1 First, who ordained it, to wit, Iesus Christ our lord and sauior, which tendeth to two especiall ends: first, to proone his eternall deitie or godhead, because it belongeth to God alone, and none other, to institute and ordaine holie signes and Sacraments in his church, whereof also it should seeme there is very great and good reason, both in as much as the Church it selfe is, the house of the liuing God, and 1. Timoth. 3. 15. his peculiar inheritance: and also because it belongeth to him alone, to giue that vertue & strength vnto elements of common and vncleane by sin, to becom purified and holy thorow grace: secondly, it seemeth to

teach

teach vs, to haue a more reuerent regarde to come to the sound knowledge and religious vse thereof, not onelie because hee being God, and the ordainer therof, hath all power in his owne handes, to punishe the prophane contemners and abusers of the same, but also because hee, of whome wee haue that that we haue, not onely as in consideration of our name, Christian, but also as in respect of all other both spirituall and bodily graces, hath instituted the same for his own glorie and our good.

2 Secondly, we are to consider when it was instituted, to wit, before his death and suffering, and that immediatelye after hee hadde with his disciples eaten the passeouer, by which we may see the Lorde Iesus had as great care for vs, as for the fathers, before his being and manifestation in the flesh: prouiding also thereby not only for our forgetfulnesse, that we might haue the continuall remembraunce of his death & passion before our eies, vntill his comming againe, but for our instruction also, this being plaine to vs, in that circumstance of tyme, that forasmuch as ỳ bread was broken in the supper before his bodie was crucified on ỳ crosse, that bread could

Matth. 26. 26.

1. Corint. 11. 26.

not be that same naturall body that was crucified on the crosse, &c: as Papistes grossely imagine and maintaine, the reason is, because those thinges that differ in time, can not bee saide in all respectes, yea, hardlye in anye respecte to bee the same.

3 Thirdly, wherefore it was ordained, to wit, to strengthen our faith in the truth of Gods promises, by which wee may see, that wee are dull and slowe of hearte to beleeue (whatsoeuer the Pelagians & the pryde of our owne mindes would perswade vs to the contrarie) GOD prouiding for the curing of this disease in vs, not onely his worde preached, but visible signes and seales also, by which, though the outward sences may be satisfied, the Lorde yet notwithstanding speaketh to our soules and consciences, the Lorde likewise instituting the same, as effectuall meanes to putte vs in remembrance, by reason of our forgetfulnesse of Iesus Christ being absent, as also of his death and passion, and of the fruites and profites wee reape thereby. Nowe a remembrance of a thing it coulde not bee, if the thing it selfe were present. And all these three

Luke 24. 25.

points

points are prooued out of 1. Corinth. 11. 23. 24.

In the second place, the deepe and due consideration of these three circumstances following, will serue much for the cleering of this question also, touching the Lords supper. 2.

1 First, which be the signes in the sacrament, to wit, the visible elements of bread and wine, which haue that strength and force in them, not of themselues, & in their owne nature, for then all bread and wine should haue the like, neither yet because they be vsed by men in the administration and participation of the supper, for if that were true, manie things then should haue the like power and effect: but in respect of the Lords institution, who indeed hath dedicated and appointed them to those holie vses, and who alone hath power to ordeine holie signes or sacraments, and to giue them that effect & propertie, as hath beene plainelie declared before.

2 Secondlie, what be the things signified thereby, to wit, the blessed bodie of Christ crucified, and his precious bloud, shed for the benefit and good of all those, that by a liuelie and stedfast faith, doo ap-

prehend and take holy of him, and all his merits: for no doubt but it was the Lords purpose, both in the elements and the vse of the same, to direct our faith to these thinges in him, which in trueth were in him, and which (such was his good pleasure towardes vs miserable wretches) should be set out vnto vs in the sacrament, otherwise the Lord Iesus should haue dallied with vs, and that in matters of no small importance, from the which as we stedfastly beleeue, he was vtterly free, so the least thought of such a conceit and dotage, should not so much as once enter into vs.

3 Thirdlie the analogie, proportion and agreement, which is betweene the signes, and the things signified, the Lord no doubt choosing such elementes as might most aptlie and fitlie expresse the things signified and sealed by the same: for otherwise, if we had had bare signes alone, without holie things signified in and by the same, as our faith had no whit at all beene prouided for, because it being spirituall and inward, is not, nor cannot be nourished with outward and corporall thinges, so wee might easilie haue beene carried a-

way

way into idolatrie or superstition at the least, whilest we directed our imagination (for I dare not call it faith) to visible and externall elements, or doted in our fantasie and vnderstanding vppon creatures, which what hurt it might haue vpone, though wee feele not by our owne experience (God be thanked therefore) yet wee may behold and see the same in the lamentable and pitifull spectacle of manie blind and superstitious ones in the world.

Now the analogie and proportion betweene the signes and the things signified in the Lords supper, may easilie be reduced and brought into three especiall heads or points.

1 First, that as verilie as that bread is broken before our bodily eies in the administration of the Lords supper, and the wine powred out, and diffused or spred abrode in the sight of vs all, speciallie whilest that manie are made partakers of the same, so verile doo we or ought we by the eie of faith to behold Christ wounded for our transgressions, & broken for our iniquities, as Isaiah saith, and his blessed body crucified, and his bloud shed vpon the

Isaiah. 53.

crosse

Matth.26.26, 27.28. 1.Cor.11.24. 25.26.

crosse for manie, for the remission of sinnes, the one being no more certeinelie performed in bodilie action and presence of the people than the other, is trulie and faithfullie accomplished in spirit & truth.

2 Secondlie, that as bread hath this property, through Gods blessing giuen it, to feed and strengthen our naturall bodies in this life: so his bodie being represented effectuallie vnto vs by that bread, and apprehended & applied vnto our selues by faith, hath the selfe same propertie touching our soules, to strengthen and to nourish them spirituallie, euen to eternall life.

Psal.104.15.

Psal.104.15. Iudg.9.13.

And euen as the wine dooth comfort & make mans heart glad, as appeareth by sundrie scriptures: so our full ioy and spirituall comfort, is to be found in none other but in him alone. And (to ioine these two togither, of which we haue spoken seuerallie) this we must know and beleeue further, that as our bodily diet is then ful, whole and perfect, as it were, when it consisteth of these two things, to wit, bread and wine or drinke: so we are to know and beleeue, that the fulnesse and perfection of all spirituall nourishment, is to be found in Christ alone, and no where else,

whilest

whileſt that he is become, as well the drinke as the meat of our ſoule, not onelie in this double ſigne helping our infirmity, but alſo teaching vs to ſeeke the heauenly refection and nourishment of our ſoules fullie and wholy in him, and no where elſe, whervnto alſo he himſelfe in ſome ſort alludeth. *Matth.* 11.28. and in other places of ſcripture. Iohn.6 35. Iohn.7.37.38.

3 Thirdlie, that euen as in our knowledge, the bread appointed for the Lords ſupper, is made of manie graines of corne, and the wine likewiſe it ſelfe of ſundrie and ſeuerall grapes, and yet all maketh but one bread, & one wine: ſo all the faithfull ſhould be inſtructed thereby, that how ſoeuer they be ſeuerall & diſtinct perſons one of them from another, euen as the ſeuerall members in mans bodie are, that yet they all compacted togither, make but one bodie in Chriſt, the onelie head thereof, as the apoſtle plainlie proueth in ſundrie places of his epiſtles, by which alſo they are admoniſhed to refer all that they doo to the glorie of their head and captaine Chriſt, and to the mutuall comfort and ſuſtentation one of another. Rom.12.4.5. 1.Cor.10.16.17.

But of all that hitherto hath beene ſpo-

ken

ken by saiv, I would pray the godlie and well affected reader, diligently to obserue and note these three things following.

1. First, that though it be most true, that euen by the ministerie of the Gospell preached, we haue Christ with all his benefits offered vnto vs, and doo by faith wrought in our harts, by the ministerie of the same word, and working of his spirit, take hold of him & all his graces, of which also S. Paule speaketh to the Galathians saieng, that Christ was described in their sight, and crucified amongst them, that yet all this notwithstanding, we haue him more plainelie and plentifullie set foorth vnto vs in the vse of the supper, whilest that we by faith feeding on him, that is the bread of life which came downe from heauen, are by that meanes become bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, and after a sort made one with him, euen as the father and he are one: which I speake not to the debasing of the word, as though the sacraments were more worthie and excellent, or to the dividing of Christ, for as in respect of his substance, he is but one, both in the word and the sacraments, but as in respect of vs, and for our

Galath. 3. 1.

John. 6. 51.

Ephes. 5. 30.

John. 17. 21. 1. Cor. 10. 16. 17.

our weakenesse sake, we hauing more of our sences sanctified in and by the vse of the elements of the Lords supper, as for example our sight, our taste, our feeling, yea and our hearing also, whilest that in the deliuerie and partaking thereof, Christes death is preached vnto vs, than we haue in the word which is directed onelie to the eare of hearing.

2 Secondlie, that this holie sacrament doeth not onelie direct our faith to the death and passion of our sauiour Christ, which was performed for vs and all the faithfull manie hundered yeeres agone, as the one, and the onelie sacrifice for sinne, neuer to be reiterated, because that thereby he being the onelie high priest and eternall sacrificer, hath consecrated for euer all them that are sanctified: but also, yea cheeflie, and especiallie, to the gracious frutes and effectes that wee receiue thereby, as the forgiuenesse of sinnes, our reconciliation to GOD, the death of iniquitie in vs, the assured pledge of eternall life, and such like: all which are liuelie set foorth and preached vnto vs in the same, to the ende that wee maye by faith

Hebr.9.28.
Hebr.10.14.

in

in a strong persuasion of Gods goodnesse towards vs in Christ, be made partakers thereof. For otherwise, if we had but Christes death onelie, and nothing else, it would be little auailable to vs: for what would it haue profited vs that he had died, if by his death he had not brought life and immortality to light? but forasmuch as his death, and the effects and frutes following the same, and flowing from it, cannot be sundered, we therefore stedfastlie beleeue, that the faithfull are neuer partakers of the one alone, but that also they are partakers of the other likewise.

2. Tim. 1. 10.

3 Thirdlie, that wee must certeinelie know, and stedfastlie beleeue that though this holie sacrament doo specially and chiefly direct vs to Christ, his death, merits, obedience, and the frutes thereof, yet notwithstanding also, it doth sensiblie and plainelie instruct vs in the speciall duties of that sound and sincere loue, which in Christ, and for Christ, we as the members of that bodie, whereof he is the only head, ought vnfeinedlie to carrie and accomplish one of vs towardes another, not onelie as profitable and necessarie for the parties to whome such duties are performed,

Ephes. 1. 22. & 5. 23.

mey, whilest in the daies of their distresse we releeue them by our wealth, or comfort and councell them by our wit, which are things that God hath giuen vs euen to the same end, but comfortable also to our selues, whilest by that as by a bage or cognizance we are knowne both to o- Iohn.13.35.
thers and our selues to be Christes disciples in deed, and haue sealed vp in our hearts the free pardon, and full forgiuenes of all our sinnes, and an assured pledge Luke.7.47. Iohn.3.14.
also, that we are translated out of darknesse into light, without the which all we haue in this life, and therefore the sacraments also could tend but to our greater condemnation.

In the third place, for the cleering of 3
this controuersie or question of the Lords supper, we must haue a watchfull eie to Satans subtleties, who painfully labourech in this point, as in all other pointes of Christian religion also, by extremities to drawe vs into all corruption. Nowe the extremities that in time heeretofore haue burst foorth, and are yet euen to this day, in manie places, stoutlie and stiflie mainteined, are especiallie three.

1 The first is, that of the sacramenta-

ries, who hold and defend, that Christ in his supper hath left vs nothing saue the bare and naked signes of his death and passion. But the trueth is, that we are so farre off from allowing this conceit and opinion, whatsoeuer our aduersaries babble and prate to the contrarie, that wee feare not openlie, and in the sunne light to affirme, that besides the signes themselues, yea and euen together with the signes, wee and all true christians haue the thinges themselues signified, not onelie truelie and effectuallie exhibited vnto vs, but giuen vs also, and bestowed vpon vs, because it is most certeine, that our Sauiour Christ, who is the trueth it selfe, and cannot lie, dooth in deede and assuredlie accomplish vnto vs, all the promises which hee made vs, and meant to seale vnto vs, by the vse of the signes in the sacrament, that so we might become partakers euen of his verie substance, and grow vp also with him into one life and being. And though this cannot be comprehended by the eie of mans reason and vnderstanding, no more than manie other things in our christian religion, yet we cannot choose but know and confesse

Iohn.24.6.

confesse, that this is sensiblie set foorth vnto vs in the vse and participation of the supper, by seuerall meanes and instruments, some of them being outward, as the elements in the sacrament, and some inward, as the spirituall grace represented thereby: for we are not angels, but men, consisting as the scripture teacheth vs, of bodie and soule: and therefore the Lord, by the vse of his word and sacraments, hath prouided for both parts, as the word for our eares, and our eares for hearing of the same, that so faith might be wrought in our hearts, and the elements in the sacrament for our taste, sight, feeling, &c: and yet our soules to be nourished and fed, not with anie or all of these outward things (for how cã outward & corruptible things nourish inward & immortall substances?) but onelie with the spirituall graces, not onelie offered, but giuen also vnto vs therein: and this likewise to be wrought in vs (though our sauiour be in heauen in respect of his bodie, & we heere as pilgrims & strangers on the earth) by the wonderfull & vnsearchable working of his holie spirit in vs, and by the meanes of a liuelie & assured faith, both which being knit to-

Eccle.12.7.

Rom.10.17.

Acts.3.21.

Psalm.39.12.

gither, doo easilie ioine togither thinges that be as farre asunder, in respect of distance of place, as one end of the earth is from the other, and as farre asunder, as heauen and earth themselues are: or else how could we either beleeue the holie catholike church, and feele the communion of saints, seeing it commonlie falleth out, that the members of that holie fellowshippe are sundered one of them from another, in respect of great distance of place? or be assured that Christes righteousnesse is become ours, seeing he is in the heauen, and wee on the earth, if by faith we did not take holde of the same, and applie it vnto our selues. Besides, if men should imbrace this sacramentarie opinion, what were it but to euert, as the trueth of Christes promises, so the certeinetie and assuredneſſe of his word, who in plaine termes calleth this holie sacrament his bodie? Wherfore be it far from vs to approoue of anie such dotage, as defaceth the trueth of the word, derogateth from Christe, and vtterlie destroieth our owne faith, than which what can be more horrible to heare, or fearefull to thinke.

2 The second extremitie is that of con-

substatiation,

ſubſtantiation, ſome affirming that there is deliuered to the people, & they receiue, togither with the ſubſtance of bread, the verie ſubſtance of Chriſtes verie naturall bodie, ſo that there is (as it were) an intermingling or mixture of both the ſubſtances, in the action of the ſupper. But this opinion is iuſtlie to be diſliked and reprooued, not onelie becauſe of the abſurdities which it hath common, with the hereſie of tranſubſtantiation (whereof we will ſpeake in the next place) but alſo becauſe it is quite and cleane contrarie to common ſence & reaſon, confounding and iumbling togither two ſeuerall & diſtinct ſubſtances, and making the leſſe, to wit, the ſubſtance of the bread, to comprehend the greater, that is, Chriſtes humane bodie, yea euen his verie Godhead, heauen and earth is not able to conteine. Beſides it dooth vtterlie take away an eſſentiall propertie of Chriſtes bodie, for if Chriſt in reſpect of his humanitie, be like vnto vs in all things, ſinne onelie excepted, and we know by the light of reaſon & vnderſtanding, that God hath beſtowed vpon vs, yea by verie experience, that our bodies are circumſcriptible, and tied to a

Iſaiah. 66. 1. Acts. 7. 49. 17. 24.

Hebr. 4. 15.

place, it must needs follow, that Christ in respect of his manhood, or Christ as he is man, is and must be tied to a place, and not be in euery place, as he must needs be, if these mens assertions be true, which is nothing els in deed but vtterlie to destroy Christs body, which also I proue against them thus: Whosoeuer taketh away the essentiall propertie of anie thing, taketh away also the verie thing it selfe. This proposition is proued by this maxime in logike: If the definition of a thing, which therein consisteth of the essentiall propertie of the thing, be taken away, then the thing it selfe also defined falleth away: as for example: If a reasonable liuing creature, which is the definition of a man be taken away, what shall become of man? or where shall he appeare, which is the thing defined? whereof also there is good reason, because the essentiall propertie is it that constituteth or maketh the thing. Hitherto the maior proposition, as we say in schooles, with the proofs thereof. Now followeth the minor or second proposition: But these men take away the essentiall propertie of a thing, to wit, of a bodie which is to be circumscriptible or tied to

a place, which is in deed an eſſentiall propertie of the bodie of man, and therefore of Chriſtes bodie as hee is man, whileſt they will haue him, as he is man, in ſundrie places at one time. If anie man will denie this, it may eaſilie be prooued both by their owne writinges in ſundrie places, and alſo by the definition of a bodie, which is a quantitie that may be diuided according to the threefold meaſuring receiued amongeſt men, that is, length, breadth, and thickeneſſe, and likewiſe by the deſcription of a place, which is defined to be a nighneſſe or touching of the thing conteining and the thing conteined. The concluſion therfore is, that in taking away place from the bodie of Chriſt (which they doo, whileſt they place it in euerie place, whereas in the nature thereof, it can be but in one place at one time) they doo vtterlie deſtroie the bodie or humanitie of Chriſt, or at the leaſt confound it ſo with the Godhead, as Eutyches did, that they make a confuſion (whereas in all trueth and vprightneſſe, there ſhoulde remaine a diſtinction of the proprieties of either nature in his bleſſed perſon. But of

this inough in this place, because it is somewhat philosophicall, and because also in the next section we shall haue occasion to deale with the like.

3 The third extremitie, is that of transubstantiation, mainteined altogither by the Romish catholiks, as they will be called, who hold that the bread and wine (the substance thereof vanishing away, and nothing being left but the accidents or qualities thereof, as in the bread, roundnesse, whitenesse, &c: and in the wine rednesse, moisture, &c:) are changed, and that by the power of certeine words spoken by the preest (as they name him) ouer the elements, they are turned into the verie naturall bodie and bloud of our sauior. Concerning this point and the branches therof, I minde to speake, both more particularlie, and more fullie, because it is one of the popish opinions, that greatlie at this present troubleth the christian world, and namelie our flourishing isle of England, and also because in the daies of persecution heeretofore, both within this land and elswhere, it hath beene the common knife that the wicked haue vsed, to cut the throtes of the godlie withall, & as it were

the

the hatchet to chop off their heads. It may be, that in this my poore trauel ſome may be conuerted, from falſhood to truth, and ſo be ſaued in the day of Chriſt: or, if that gratious effect followe not in the aduerſaries, yet I hope the friendes and louers of truth, ſhall by this meanes be ſomwhat ſtaied, that they be not caried away with certaine inticing and inchaunting wordes, in the mouths of ſome ſeducing ſpirites, whom Antichriſt Satans eldeſt ſonne hath thruſt into the worlde, to peruert men from the truth and obedience of God.

1 Firſt, for the name of Tranſubſtantiation, I feare not to affirme, that it is verye newe and neuer heard of, before the days of pope Innocent the third, who was about the yeare of our Lorde, 1205, much leſſe was it confirmed as an article of faith, before the Councell of Laterane, which was kept and holden in his dayes. And though wee might by authoritie of good hiſtoriographers, make it yet ſomewhat more new, namely, that it was not ratified as an article of religion, till the Councell kept at Conſtance, a citie ſo named in Germanie, in the dayes of Pope

John the 23, which was about the yere of our Lord, 1415. Yet to gratifie them, wee wil grant it, to be as old, as the councel of Lateran in Rome, held in the yere 1215, chã the which also their own writers will not prescribe further. But alas what get they hereby, namely, that this their dotage and dreame of transubstantiation, at the least, in the name of it, hath not so manie gray haires on the head, or yeares on the backe of it, as they would beare the world in hand it hath, for, as by computation it may appeare, it is but 300 & od yeres old. Neither wil that shift serue, that they flee to here, to wit, that though the terme were not till then, yet the matter was before. A verie likelie thing forsooth, as though the fathers of the Greeke and Latin churches, so well skilled in those seuerall languages, had not bin able aswel to haue deliuered the word as the matter. In points of greater consequence than this by farre, they hadde their peculiar and significant words, as trinitie, harmonously, hypostasis, and such like, and yet in this they must faile forsooth, to the end, that the glorie of new inuention or forgerie rather may bee ascribed to some other. But to conclude this

Garan. in sinu. Concilio Harding in confut. Apolog.

this point: If papists vnder a false cloke of nouelti̇e, will not spare to reiect, not onely vse, but good and true things also, then much more may we, and that vppon good ground refuse this fantasie, not onelie because it is new, but also because it is false, as shal (god willing) hereafter more fullie appeare.

2 Howbeit, that there is a chaunge, no man of sound iudgement, I thinke, dooth, or will denie; but that is not in respect of the nature of the thinges themselues: for the elements of bread and wine remaine in their owne proper & peculiar substance, wherof not only al men may be sufficient witnesses, but almost all the senses of euery man, as sight, tasse, feeling, &c: but this mutation is made in regarde of the vse and ende wherevnto they are applied, because that they are by the Lordes owne institution and appointment, separated from the common vse, yea, & as it were frō common bread and wine, and applied, not onlie to a holy vse, whilest they are vsed in holie assemblies, wyth sanctified and religious mindes, but dedicated also to holie endes, that is to saye, to ratifie and confirme our Faith in the trueth of

Gods

Gods promises, and to be sure seales and pledges to our consciences, of holy things; to wit, of christs body and bloud, and of the effects and fruits, that by his death & passion wee receiue. But that this chaunge shoulde be wrought, by any words, as they say, of consecration, I am so farre off from allowing it as true, that I am verily perswaded, that they speake they knowe not what, because it is not yet resolued, not onely amongst the doctors of their side, as Bessarian, Biel, Bonauenture, Catharin, Durand, Scotus, and others, which be the words of cõsecratiõ, or with which words Christ, and the priest by his example, maketh the bread Christs body, but because a pope himselfe (who hath the fulnes of all knowledge in his breast, and cannot erre, if all bee true that they affirme) I meane Pope Innocent the third, a great fauourer and furtherer of such fantasies, coulde not well tell how to resolue it, as appeareth by his writings. Yea, in ascribing mutation and change of things, to a forme of wordes vttered by the mouth of a mortall man, they blasphemously robbe God of that glorie which is due vnto him alone: For to him onelie it belongeth to

Innocent. de sacr. altar. myster. lib. 4. cap. 6.

Psalm. 148. 5.

speake

ſpeake the woorde, and to haue thinges made, and giue it to an other, to whom it at no hand appertaineth. And if woꝛdꝭ be ſo ſtrong in the one Sacrament, as to turne bꝛead into Chꝛiſtes body, and wine into his bloud, what reaſon is there, that the woꝛdes of inſtitution, vttered by the ſame perſon, I meane the pꝛieſt, with intent alſo to conſecrat, it ſhold not alter the element of water in the other ſacrament, to wit, of Baptiſme, and be ſo ſtrong and powerfull, as to make the ſame, the very true and naturall bloud of our Sauiour Chꝛiſt? But let them ſay what they will. Foꝛ mine owne parte, I reſt reſolute in this, that this aſſertion, and their whole action in conſecration ſauoureth verye ſtronglie of a magicall incantation, and I am ſo muche the moꝛe confirmed in this, becauſe the Papiſtes reioycing, as inchaunters and ſoꝛcerers doo, in theyꝛ odde numbers, haue added one woꝛde, that is to ſaye (*enim*) which is not in the Gꝛeeke oꝛ Latine textes, to the woꝛdes of inſtitution, ſayeng: *Hoc eſt enim corpus meum*, as may appeare in their miſſall oꝛ maſſe booke, and that not their old ones onelie, but in one newlie furbiſhed. by

Miſſali Romano ex decreto concil. Trident. reſtitutum, & Pij quinti iuſſu editum, pa. 23. col. 3

by the decree of the councel of Trent, and published abroad to beholde the light, like an vntimelie birth, by the authoritie and commandement of Pope Pius the fift.

3 And as the noueltie of this fained fantasie of transubstantiation, is a brand good enough, to worke the discredit thereof, euen as though it had beene bored thorow the eare, or worne a paper for forgerie and deceit, so the grosse and palpable absurdities which follow the same opinion, are sufficient, and strong enough of themselues, to make it out of credit with all persons, indued with holie wisedome and right vnderstanding, and to cause thē to esteeme of it, not onely as a thing false and erronious, but very vngodlie and blasphemous also. To reckon vp all, or largelie to discourse vppon the particulars, neither is it my purpose, neither is it almost possible, so fertile a soile, is this point in falshoode, and yet I minde to touch some, and that in suche sorte also, as the vanitie and falshoode of this greate corruption, may thereby easilie appeare, to all suche as will not be wilfully blinded, or stoppe their eies and eares, at the brightnes and sound of truth. At the least,

my

my hope and persuasion is, that though I preuaile not either with the malicious blinde, or simple ignorant, yet I shall confirme and strengthen my brethren, who together with me, as in many other pointes of our christian religion, so in this, haue embraced the truth of God to our cõforts.

1 First, I saye, that this assertion of Transubstantiation, or reall presence of Christes naturall bodie, dooth vtterlie ouerthrowe and destroy the nature of a sacrament, which, as all men knowe and confesse, must euer consist of two partes, to wit, of visible elements, and inuisible graces: the trueth whereof appeareth not onely by the generall consent of all men, as before is alleadged, but also by the particular viewe of all the Sacramentes mentioned in the olde or newe testament. But this trueth is not onely defaced, and laid euen wyth the ground, but swalowed vp also, and, as it were, brought to nothing, if so be it, that the nature and substance of the elements, bee either chaunged, or vanish awaie, in this matter of the lords supper, as some affirme and hold, & the things represented by ỹ same come in their place. The reason wherof is plaine and euident,

to

to witte, that the one parte of the Sacrament, namely, the visible signe, is then and there absent. And therefore it must of necessitie followe, that not onelie the nature of a Sacrament is destroyed, but by consequent also the Sacrament it self, because the nature of a thing being taken away, the thing it selfe can not stand or continue, for the nature is it, whereof the thing it selfe consisteth. Yea this also falleth out vpon it, that those men that in the pride and vanitie of their owne hearts inlarge the number of Sacraments, aboue them that christ hath left vnto his church, publishing to the worlde, that there are seauen, where indeede there are but two. In the true and naturall vse of the worde Sacrament, are founde, not onelie to bee clippers of the Lordes coine, but vtter defacers of his holie ordinaunce, in taking from the Churche (whatsoeuer they pretend to the contrarie) one of those that Christ hath left to the same, for the comforte thereof: beeing founde likewise by this meanes, not onelie presumptuous against Christ, but iniurious also to the people, in spoiling them of so great consolation. So fruitfull in vngodlinesse is

the

the euill weede of corrupt doctrine. Indeede if the ſigne of the ſacrament, and the thing ſignified by the ſame, were thinges contrary, they might haue ſome ſhew of reaſon, for this vnmeaſurable affection, but forasmuch as wee all knowe them to be, not thinges contrary, but diuers, no doubt, but they not onely may, but do very well ſtand together, the one of them beeing ſo farre, from deſtroying or defacing of an other, that they in a moſt louing conſent agree and concurre together to the ſetting foorth of Gods glorie, and the ſpirituall good and comforte of hys children. Wherefore, I ſaye, it cannot be auoided, but that they doe very ill, that do thus malapertlie diſioyne and put in ſunder ſuch things, as God hath moſt wiſelie ioyned and glewed as it were faſt together.

2 Secondlie, I affirme, that this doctrine is woonderfullie iniurious vnto the glorified bodie of our Sauiour, not onely whileſt it fetcheth him from heauen the place of all ſuch bleſſednelle, as can not be conceiued, much leſſe ſpoken of, into the earth, the place of all vnſpeakeable miſerie and wretchednelle, which yet is not

all, this circumstaunce further aggrauating the erroꝛ of this vniuſt aſſertion, that they make the bleſſed body of Chꝛiſt, our Loꝛd and god, ſubiect to the call of a moꝛtall and miſerable creature (the pꝛieſt I meane, as they name him) as though if he bade go, it ſhould go, oꝛ if he commaunded it to come, it ſhoulde come, &c: But alſo whileſt it maketh it, to be rent and toꝛne in peeces, not only with the teeth of good mẽ, a matter which our nature abhoꝛreth, both in reſpect of ꝑ rawnes of it, & alſo in reſpect of the ſubſtãce of it. foꝛ we are not Anthropophagi, that is, eaters of mans fleſh, but euen with the teeth of the wicked and vngodlie alſo, which euen foꝛ this cauſe, if there were no moꝛe, is moſt vntrue and falſe, becauſe that then they ſhold liue foꝛ euer, in as muche as all that eate his fleſhe and drincke his bloude, haue this pꝛomiſe, that they haue eternall life. And yet theſe wicked menne ceaſe not heere, but pꝛoceede to further impietie, ſome of the chiefeſt among them affirming (though in deede others are not ſo reſolute in it, by whyche alſo wee may ſee, that there is not ſo muche vnitie oꝛ conſent amongeſt Popiſhe diuines

Iohn 6.54.

and

and dortors, as they pretend) that mice, rattes, dogges, hogges, and other vnreasonable creatures, falling vpon consecrated hostes, and deuouring the same doo vndoubtedlie eate the blessed bodie of our Sauiour. And if they staied here, their sinne were somewhat lesse, but this is not all the mischiefe that falleth out in this behalfe: for whereas in trueth and christian religion, the bodie of our Sauiour Christ is now immortall, and in immortall glorie, as Gods worde, and the articles of our Beleefe agreeing with the same doo plainelye teache vs, these menne subiect it to putrefaction, corruption, and wormes, by reason of the long reseruation thereof, and at the last, to consuming in the fire (a fact of most horrible crueltie, if it were Christes flesh, but no maruaile though they deale so with him, when they handle hys Saints as hardelie as that commeth vnto, which thing experience of all ages dooth sufficientlye prooue) because it maye not otherwise bee made awaye (as they themselues confesse) if it be once taken with hoarsinesse, mouldines, or such like. If any man doubt of the truth and certaintie of these points

obiected against them, lette hym but reade their owne wozkes, and hee shall see the matter sufficientlie cleared. Yea, I suppose, that the verye aduersaries themselues will not growe so shameleſſe, as to denie that which with a full mouth, and in the open Sunne light, hath beene published by the best of their side. And if they woulde oz shoulde, yet wee haue the liues, and the leaues, the wozdes and the wozkes, in sentence and sense, foz manner and matter to charge them wythall, and to thzowe this dung into their faces.

3 Thirdly, I say, that by consequent it doth most cursedly confounde (if not vtterlie subuert and ouerthzowe) the humanitie of our Sauiour, with his Godhead, whileſt that which indeede and all trueth, is pzoper and peculiar to the eternall Deitie onely: foz example, to be euerie where, which can not agree to anie but to GOD alone, as both reason and religion will sufficiently perswade, if wee will giue eare vnto the same, is yet notwythstanding, most blasphemouslye attributed and ascribed to his manhoode, which (as hath beene already shewed before)

foze) and ſhall moze plainelie, if GOD will, be prooued heereafter, is, and muſt of neceſſitie, ſince the time of his moſte glozious aſcenſion into Heauen, and ſitting at the right hande of the maieſtie of GOD his Father, the very onelie ſeate and throne, as it were, of his bodilie reſidence, bee circumſcriptible and tied to a place. As foz that which they are woont vſuallie to obiect, foz the impeachement of this trueth, and the eſtabliſhement of their owne errour, beeing taken from the glozification of our Sauiours bodie, is eaſilie beaten backe and aunſweared, as which indeede, if it bee well weighed, is not onelie vntrue, as in reſpect of it ſelfe: becauſe, though glozification implie a moſt excellent and heauenlie eſtate, dooth not yet foz all that deſtroye the eſſentiall properties of bodies glozified, but moſt abſurde and falſe alſo, as in regard of vs. Foz if the glozification of Chriſts bodie, haue remooued oz taken awaye that eſſentiall propertie, to witte, that it ſhoulde truelie, and indeede, bee tied vnto a place, then the like ſhall bee perfourmed, and the ſame effect followe, in all the glozified bodies of the faithfull

after the reſurrection, becauſe our Sauiour hath not onelie glorified his owne bodie for himſelfe, hee riſing therein a mightie conqueror ouer death and hell, and nowe triumphantlie ruling and raigning in the heauens in all maieſtie, but for our ſakes alſo hath atchieued that greate honour, wee hauing from him this aſſured promiſe in his worde, that God ſhal chaunge our bale and vile bodies, that they may bee faſhioned like vnto his glorious bodie, according vnto the mightie working, whereby hee is able to ſubdue all things vnto himſelfe. But to ſaye, that our bodies glorified after the riſing againe of the ſame in the generall day of iudgement ſhall be euery where, a raſhe and vncertaine, yea, a beaſtlie and blaſphemous aſſertion, becauſe it aſcribeth that vnto vs, which is proper and peculiar onelie to GOD: for vnto hym alone it perteineth to fill, heauen, earth, and all places, alwayes, and at one tyme, as infinite places of Scripture doo plainelie proue, therefore this opinion alſo, concerning Chriſtes glorified bodie, beeing euerie where, or in infinite places at one time, muſt of neceſſitie

Philip. 3. 21.

be

be ſuche likewiſe.

4 Fourthlie, it doth directlye deſtroy, and, as it were, at one blowe blotte out, and deface, all thoſe Articles of our moſte pretious Faith, and Chriſtian religion, whych doo concerne Chriſtes aſſured aſcenſion into Heauen, hys mateſticall ſitting at the right hande of the Father, and his glorious comming agayne from thence, together wyth that infinite number of moſte playne places of GODS holie woorde, that out of the writinges of the Prophetes and Apoſtles, may bee drawen for the proofe of thoſe moſte comfortable and neceſſarie pointes. To deale wyth euerye one of theſe by themſelues ſhortely, and in fewe woordes: I woulde faine knowe if our Sauiour Chriſt be here vpon earth, in reſpect of his bodilye power and preſence, howe hee can iuſtlie, as in regarde of the ſame hys bodye, bee ſayde to haue aſcended into Heauen: Or let them tel vs, if hee remaine wyth vs in hys fleſh, howe hee can bee truelye ſaide in hys manhoode, to ſitte at the right hande of hys Father in Heauen: Or howe it can bee in religion or reaſon affirmed, that our

Sauiour shall come from Heauen, with great power and glorie to iudge the quick and the dead, seeing he is here on earth already. The Scripture telleth vs for his ascension, that in the sight and beholding of the blessed Apostles, yea whiles they looked stedfastly towards heauen, he was taken vp: Let them shew so much for his bodilie abode vpon earth, and proue it by such substantiall witnesse, and wee are readie to yeelde. Besides, we knowe by the worde, and therefore beleeue it, that as he was seene go into heauen, so shall he come againe: but hee was seene to ascend thither bodilie, and therefore so shall hee returne from thence againe. I suppose they will not saye, that our Sauiour had two bodies, one that hee tooke wyth him, an other that hee left heere, for that were to make him altogether monstrous, and meu scrupulous, wene knowing in whether of them hee performed the worke of their redemption. And to saye that that one blessed bodie of his was diuided, is as absurde and erroneous, because it can not be so, but that the whole bodie it selfe must be impaired and mangled, at the least, if not destroyed and so

Actes 1.9.

Actes 1.10.

the worke of saluation ouerthrowne. To stand vpon anie naked interpretation touching the right hand of God, will not serue their turne: for there being nothing meant thereby in this article of our beleefe, but the great glorie that is in heauen prepared for the saints, and that most excellent blessednesse that belongeth to them, whereof our sauior Christ was in a most full measure made by his ascention into heauen, as in respect of his humanitie absolute partaker, what could they gaine? Doo they imagine that it would heerupon insue, that Christ should be euerie where, and by consequent on earth? but they are deceiued: for why doo they not as well consider the worke sitting, which implieth locall residence in a place? or doo they not know and beleeue that heauen it selfe is not euerie where, but locall rather? or will they not see, that without warrant of the word (yea contrarie to the same, which in sundrie places opposeth heauen and earth one of them against another) or sence of humane iudgement, they tumble and confound them together? Reason will lead vs to this, that none can be said to goe vp into the place where he is, or to come

downe from it, when he remaineth there. And though wee minde not to subiect our sauiour, specialtie as in respect of his eternall Godhead to humane sence, yet by the same we may and ought to be leeue not to destroy the essentiall properties of his manhood. Now then, whether shall wee beleeue this trueth of the Lord, or mens fantasies that go about to peruert our persuasions, and deceiue our vnderstandings? Let men of the worlde deeme what they lust, this is the truth that God hath sanctified vnto vs in his word, and I doo stedfastlie beleeue it in my heart, and will through Gods goodnesse and strength alwaies, confesse the same with my mouth, that from the very time of Christes ascension into Heauen, The Heauens must conteine his naturall bodie vntill the time that all things be restored, that is euen to the worlds end.

Act. 3. 21.

5 Fiftlie, I say that this opinion dooth vntrustlie depriue vs of all such spirituall graces and comforts for our consciences, as God the father in his sonne Christ, by sending the Holie ghost the third person in the deitie, hath not onelie promised, but in good time will performe and bestow vp-

on

on the whole church generallie and euerie ſound particular member of the ſame: yea if we wey it well we ſhall finde, that it is the ruine and bane of the church it ſelfe, both in the whole bodie of it, and in the ſeuerall parts. Our ſauior himſelfe in moſt plaine and expreſſe terms ſaith: I tel you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the comforter will not come vnto you, but if I depart I will ſend him vnto you. Hee that knoweth anie thing of truth, is well acquainted with this, that generallie all the word, but moſt eſpecialliе the comfortable promiſes conteined in the ſame, be as it were, the life and ſoule of the church it ſelfe. The veritie and certeintie whereof, though it lie in Chriſt, becauſe in him al Gods promiſes are yea and amen; yet the particular applications of the ſame to our owne harts, muſt come from the powerfull working of the holie ſpirit. But how ſhall we come to the effectuall feeling of theſe, if the force of the ſpirit be not ſhed abrode into our hearts? or how can the holie ſpirit be called the pledge of Gods promiſes, and the earneſt penie of our adoption and ſaluation, if that promiſe of

Iohn.16.7.

1.Cor.1.20.

Epheſ.1.13.

our

our sauior Christ be not accomplished: or how can we find comfort against the feare of death: or peace in our consciences against the sight of sinne, and iudgement due vnto vs for the same without this? Of a truth, the remembrance of our dissolution, and departure hense (this being remooued) shall be greeuous, and the horrour of hell, the iust punishment of our iniquitie will be readie euery houre to ouerwhelme vs. Wee need not stand long vpon this point: either this must be true, that wee haue the Holie ghost, in most abundant measure, by the bodilie absence of our sauior Christ, giuen to the church, as before is said and proued, and so a spirituall supplie bestowed vpon vs for a bodilie want, that being more excellent than this, because the apostle saith, that henceforth we know no man after the flesh, yea though we had knowne Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more: or elle if Christ be heere bodilie present, the Holy ghost is not yet come, nor the apostles indued with miraculous graces, nor the fulnesse of the Gentils gathered in, nor the comfort and peace of the church prouided for: all which are feare-

full

full to thinke vpon, but much more horrible to feele, and in deed are quite & cleane contrarie to the truth of the word: and if we had no more but onlie the ſecond chapter of the Acts of the apoſtles, it were ſufficient to ouerthrow the ſame.

6 Sixtlie, this aſſertion doeth not onelie cloſelie, but openlie accuſe Chriſt himſelfe of manifeſt lieng & vntrueth, who as both the prophets and apoſtles doo beare witneſſe, did no ſinne, neither was there any guile found in his mouth. He himſelfe hath plainlie told vs: The poore ye haue alwaies with you, and when yee will ye may doo them good, but me yee ſhall not haue alwaies. And againe elſwhere: I go to prepare a place for you. If this be not blaſphemie, to doo what we can to taint him with falſhood, that is both truth it ſelfe, and the author of all truth, I know not what is blaſphemie. And yet this iniquitie ſtaieth not heere, for it depriueth vs firſt of the comfort of the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, becauſe if our ſauiour haue beene tainted with anie manner of, iniquitie though neuer ſo ſmall, he cannot be a price and ranſome for ſin, becauſe he that muſt recommit ſinners to God, muſt of neceſſi-

Iſaiah.53.9. 1.Peter.2.22.

Marke.14.7.

Iohn.14.2.

tie

tie be free from transgression. Secondlie, it dooth (as it were) violentlie take and pull from vs, the hope that we haue of the heauenlie inheritance. For why hath our sauior Christ sundred himselfe for a space from vs, as in respect of his bodilie presence, not yet leauing vs comfortlesse (for he hath giuen vs his spirit to supplie (as it were) his absence) but to the end that we might hereafter in time to come most comfortablie enioye him, bothe in bodie and soule for euermore? Dooth not hee himselfe say: Yet a little while and yee shall not see me: and againe, a little while and ye shall see me, for I go to my father? And in another place: Though I go to prepare a place for you, yet will I come againe, and receiue you vnto my selfe, that where I am there may yee be also. And yet all this notwithstanding, superstitious and brainesicke people, dare with open mouth affirme, that we haue him continuallie with vs here vpon earth, and that not in respect of his spirituall power and presence onelie, whereunto we our selues most gladlie yeeld (as a verie principall comfort vnto vs, in the daies of all our distresses) because in that respect,

Iohn.16.16.

Iohn.14.3.

as

as God eternall with his father, we beleeue that he filleth all places, both in heauen and in earth, and is ſaid to be with the beleeuers euen vnto the end of the world, but as in reſpect of his corporall and bodilie preſence alſo, than the which nothing vndoubtedlie can be more falſe and abſurd, as hath beene ſufficientlie ſhewed alreadie, and plainelie prooued before. Matthæ. 28.

Now hauing waded thus farre in the trueth and certeinetie of the matter it ſelfe, wee might ſafelie ſhut vp and conclude this point, but that there remaine ſundrie of the aduerſaries obiections to be anſwered: wherin I cannot but let the godlie reader vnderſtand, that I minde not to anſwer either all of them, or manie of them, becauſe the moſt in trueth be friuolous and vaine, and it would be ouer tedious to wade into ſuch idle and vnprofitable matter. Three there are in deede, which becauſe they ſeeme to be of ſpeciall ſtrength and ordinarie vſe, I can not let paſſe. Two of them are taken from the words of the text of holie ſcripture, and the third from the omnipotencie and almightie power of our ſauiour Chriſt;

which

which though they be common things in deed, and such as might as easilie be reiected as obiected, because the controuersie is not touching the plaine wordes of the text, and the almightie power of Christ, as God (for be it far from vs to be so absurd, as to draw things of such euidency and excellencie into question, but we striue rather, as for the true sence & naturall meaning of the wordes, so for the veritie of Christes person, and the essentiall properties of either his distinced natures) yet we cannot, but both for the strengthening of them that be weake and ignorant in the same, as also for the discharge of our conscience before God and man, but in a word or two, as it were, make a short, but withal a sound, sufficient, and true answer I hope, to euery one of these three seuerallie, and by themselues.

1 The first place obiected is these words of our sauiour, in the gospell after Iohn: Except ye eat the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, ye haue no life in you. Wherevnto I answer: first that neither these words, neither the rest of the chapter, can in anie probabilitie or shew of reason, properlie be vnderstood of

Iohn.6.53.

the

the Lords ſupper. And if we had no more for it but this, yet were this ſufficient, becauſe at that time, the ſupper it ſelfe was not inſtituted and ordeined, but a long while after, as in the euangeliſts writings dooth plainelie appeare: but muſt rather be referred to our ſpirituall communicating or partaking with Chriſt, by the meanes of a liuelie and ſtedfaſt faith, apprehending the word generallie, and applieng particularlie vnto our ſelues, all the gracious and ſweet promiſes that the Lord hath made and offered vnto vs therein, which may plainelie appeare to be moſt true, partlie becauſe he perſiſteth by a continuall thread of ſpeech (as it were) in the metaphor of bread or meat, mentioned before verſ. 26. 27. vſing alſo for that purpoſe, as euerie man may eaſilie perceiue, ſundrie borrowed ſpeeches, agreeing well to the circumſtance of the matter wherein he was to deale, which he would not, or needed not to haue doone, if he had meant ſo groſlie or carnallie, as theſe men fantaſie: and partlie becauſe he ſpeaketh ſo often, not of eating onelie, but alſo of beleeuing, as verſe. 35. 40. which can not be properlie attributed to anie outward

or materiall thing, ſuch as the bodie and
fleſh of Chriſt then was and is, but to in-
ward and ſpirituall matters, which as it
may be gathered by ſundrie places of ho-
lie ſcripture, the apoſtle affirming, that
Rom.8.24. hope that is ſeene is no hope: for how
can a man hope for that which hee
2.Cor.5.7. ſeeth? and that we walke by faith, and
Hebr.11.1. not by ſight, yea and that faith it ſelfe is
the ground of things which are hoped
for, and the euidence of thinges which
are not ſeene: ſo alſo may it be prooued
euen by the verie nature of faith, which
being a ſpirituall and inward qualitie gi-
Philip.1.29. uen vs of God, who is nothing elſe but
Iohn.4.24. ſpirit & trueth, and wrought in vs by ſpi-
rituall meanes, as the word & ſacraments
outwardlie, and the Holie ghoſt inwardly
in our hearts, muſt alſo of neceſſitie be di-
rected to ſpirituall & inward things. But
let vs for reaſoning ſake grant that the
place were to be vnderſtood of the holie
ſupper, yet doth it not for all that eſtabliſh
anie groſſe and carnall eating of the na-
turall fleſh or bodie of our ſauiour Chriſt,
becauſe if that were ſo, then had not our
ſauiour ſufficientlie anſwered the Caper-
naits or Iewes of Capernaum, who

vainelie

vainelie dreaming and doting of ſuch a groſſe and carnall manducation or eating, ſaid: How can this man giue vs his ſleſh? meaning thereby that it was altogither impoſſible and vnnaturall, both in reſpect of himſelfe, and in regard of them alſo, becauſe it was ſeldome or neuer heard of except it were amongſt the Anthropophagi, that men did willinglie giue their fleſh to be food vnto others, or that others did eat the ſame, but had rather yeelded vnto them in that their conceipt, which beſides that it conteineth an errour in religion and nature, as before hath beene ſhewed, is quite and cleane contrarie to the purpoſe of Chriſt in that place, and cloſelie accuſeth him, as though either in ignorance he could not, or in an euill minde he would not haue inſtructed them in their blindneſſe, all which are horrible to heare, blaſphemous to ſpeake, and beaſtlie to thinke. Beſides, if that corrupt ſence ſhould be allowed, marke what a Sea of abſurdities woulde inſue therevpon. As firſt in what a miſerable eſtate ſhoulde wee leaue the holie Fathers of the olde couenaunts, who were longe before the time of Chriſtes ta- Iohn 6.52.

king our fleſh vpon him, & therefore could not eat it, and ſo by conſequent could not be ſaued. And yet our ſauiour in plaine termes affirmeth, that they were in the kingdome of heauen. And S. Paule alſo ſaith, that they did all eat the ſame ſpirituall meat that wee doo, and did all drinke the ſame ſpirituall drinke that we doo: which word ſpirituall would be marked as directlie oppoſite to groſſe, carnall, or bodilie eating, plainelie alſo prouing that betwixt their ſacraments and ours there was no difference at all, as in reſpect of ſubſtance and effect, ſauing only that theirs were in time before ours, euen as they themſelues alſo were, and inſtituted in other outward elements than ours. Secondlie in what a miſerable caſe & condition ſhould we put poore infants, ſpecialle of the beleeuers, if they ſhould be taken away by death before that cõming to the yeers of diſcretion, they could communicat or partake in that holie ſacrament. One of theſe two groſſe abſurdities muſt needs follow therevpon, yea & be granted alſo, vnleſſe men wilbe ſtifnecked in error, to wit, either that infants muſt haue the holie communion miniſtred vnto them, which

Matth. 8. 11.

1. Cor. 10. 3. 4.

which thing in deed Auguſtine did once fantaſticallie imagine, as appeareth by manie places of his woꝛks, notwithſtanding all that papiſts ſay to cleere him therof. But S. Paule is flatlie againſt it, who will haue none admitted thereto, but ſuch as can examine & trie themſelues, whether they be in the faith or no, which infants cannot doo, as all men may plainlie perceiue, not onlie becauſe they want reaſon, as in the pꝛactiſe therof, but ſpeciallie becauſe they be void of faith, which oꝛdinarilie & commonlie is beſtowed vpon the faithfull, by hearing the woord pꝛeached, as the apoſtle ſaith: oꝛ els that without it, they are all condēned already, which is verie abſurd & beaſtlie, not onlie becauſe it tieth grace, yea the grace of ſaluation to the ſacrament, by the woꝛke wꝛought, than the which what can be moꝛe vnreſonable? foꝛ ſo good and bad hauing the outward ſigne, ſhall alſo haue the thing it ſelfe, to wit, eternall life, but alſo becauſe it aboliſheth, as Gods eternall election, whereby he hath choſen thoſe that be his in Chꝛiſt, to life euerlaſting, befoꝛe the foundations of the woꝛld were laied, ſo his gracious and continuall couenant made to vs, that

1. Corinth. 11. 28
2. Corinth. 13.

Rom. 10. 17.

he will be a louing God and mercifull fa-
Genesis.17.7. ther to vs and to our seed for euer, by which couenant also we are assured euen of his good will and fauor towards vs in Christ. By all this we may see, that euen for the auoiding of these absurdities, and manie such like, the place of the sixt of John can at no hand be vnderstood either of the sacrament or of the carnall eating of Christes bodie in the same, or of anie such grosse thing whatsoeuer, but of the apprehension or laieng holde of him, togither with the particular application of him to our selues by the hand or instrument of faith, who euen for that purpose is propounded and set foorth vnto vs, by the ministerie of his word and Gospell, or (if the aduersaries will needs haue it so) offered vnto vs in the vse of the supper. because that though the thinges bee diuerse, representing him vnto vs, as the word and sacraments, yet there is in that respect but one meane giuen vs, to take holde of him by (euen as he himselfe is but one Christ, that in these sundrie things is exhibited vnto vs) and that is that great grace and gift of faith, which we must vse in in the word and sacraments, as men

doo in the apprehending of Chriſtes righteouſneſſe: which righteouſneſſe of his, though it be not eſſentiallie dwelling in vs, yet it is effectuallie made ours, whileſt we apprehend and lay holde of it by a ſound and ſure faith, applieng the ſame alſo vnto our owne hearts: and euen in like ſort is Chriſt God and man, togither withall his merits, not onelie offered, but laid holde of in the word and ſacraments; yea and comfortablie felt likewiſe to the ſpirituall ſuſtentaion and nourishment of our ſoules, whereof alſo this is a good reaſon, that of like thinges, there is alwaies, and ſo ſhould be continuallie a like conſideration.

The ſecond place obiected, is that ſentence reported by the three euangeliſts, Matthew, Marke, and Luke, and Saint Paule himſelfe alſo, reciting the inſtitution of the ſupper, which our ſauior Chriſt vſed, ſaieng: This is my bodie: which they vrge in the letter after this ſort. Hath not Chriſt ſaid it in plaine termes? and ſhall not I beleeue it, though that my carnall vnderſtanding can not conceiue the ſame? To all which I anſwer, firſt that the queſtion is not of the bare woordes 2

Matth. 26. 26. Marke. 14. 22. Luke. 22. 19. 1. Cor. 11. 24.

or letter, for we as well as they confes the ſame, and what man hath there beene that euer doubted thereof? yea what heretike euer was there, that would not, or did not allege the letter of the text, for the maintenance & vpholding of his hereſie or error? but of the true ſence and right meaning thereof, which whether they or we haue & gaine, ſhall I hope appeare anon, to the vpright reader. Secondlie, we confeſſe alſo, that we are bound to beleeue all ſuch things as are cõprehended in gods word, yea though our ſenſuall reaſon cannot in deed comprehend the ſame: for be it farre from vs, to labor to bring the incomprehẽſible truth of the eternall maieſtie within the ſtrait bounds and limits of mans vnderſtanding, no though he were regenerated, and had receiued a great meaſure of the graces of Gods holie ſpirit: and yet in ſuch ſort muſt we beleeue them all, & that to ſuch ends alſo, as the lord himſelfe hath appointed, at no hand ſtretching thẽ further, than the Lord would haue vs, for that is to be wiſe in our owne eies, & to make our ſelues more ſharpe ſighted than God, nor yet reſtreining them to narrower purpoſes than the Lord hath laied them out

for

foꝛ, foꝛ that were, at the leaſt, great vnfaithfulneſſe, both towards the Loꝛd himſelfe, and men alſo, neither yet failing in the allegation of them, either in the matter, maner, oꝛ ende, foꝛ if wee do ſo, we doo nothing elſe therby, but heape vp iuſt condemnation againſt our owne ſoules, but reuerently receiuing them, and faithfully alleadging them in that iuſte meaſure, weight, and pꝛopoꝛtion, that the Loꝛde himſelfe hath left them vnto vs, euen as his onlie lawful and currant coine, which we can not clip, imbaſe, oꝛ impaire anie manner of waye, without high treaſon againſt his eternall maieſtie. Nowe concerning the woꝛdes, and the plaineneſſe of them. I ſay, that other woꝛdes, both in the old and new Teſtament, are as plaine as they, which yet notwithſtanding muſt be otherwiſe interpꝛeted, than the woꝛds themſelues ſeeme to impoꝛt, oꝛ elſe, not onelye abſurdities in reaſon, but erroꝛs in religion will inſue therevpon. Foꝛ example in the booke of Exodus, the paſchal lambe, with the ceremonies belonging thereto, is called, The Lords paſſeouer: whereas nowe we knowe, and no manne can choole but confeſſe, that it was not Exod. 12. 11.

the Lordes passeouer in deede, but signified and sette out the same rather. For the Lordes passeouer was his ouer-passing or passing by the Israelites houses, marked wyth the bloud of the Lambe, to the Egyptians, there to destroy the first borne. So likewise in the newe Testament, Christ sayth of hym selfe, I am the vine, than the which what can bee more plaine? And yet wee acknowledge wyth our mouthes, and beleeue in our heartes, that Christ was no naturall vine, but rather that hee calleth himselfe so, in a certaine resemblaunce, because looke what propertie the fruit of the vine hath in respect of our bodies, to witte, to comforte menne, and to make them glad heartes, the same hath Christ and the fruites of his grace receiued by Fayth, in respect of our soules, namelie, to replenishe our heartes wyth all Spirituall ioye and gladnesse, both of this life, and of the life to come. And as the braunches of the vine, haue nothing of themselues, but all that they haue, they haue it from the vine it selfe, so none whosoeuer they be can bring foorth fruit, but by abiding in him, and beeing made fruitefull thorow

Iohn 15.5.

owe hys grace. And euen in like manner is the bread of the Lordes Supper called hys bodie, becauſe (as wee haue ſaide before) looke what proper and peculiar office, the bread hath or yeelded to our naturall bodies, namely, to nouriſh and ſtrengthen the ſame, the like dooth Ieſus Chriſtes bodie broken, taken hold of by Faith, Spirituallie communicate vnto our ſoules, namelie, it feedeth and ſtrengtheneth them, to the aſſured hope and feeling of eternall life. And this maner of ſpeech, attributing that to the ſigne which is proper and peculiar to the thing ſignified, is very vſuall in the Scripture, as a man meanely conuerſant in the ſame may plainelie perceiue: the cauſe whereof, is, the ſtraight analogy, proportion, & agreement, which is betweene ỹ ſigne, & the thing ſignified, and not anie other reſpect of conſubſtantiation, tranſubſtantiation, or any ſuch like fantaſticall dotage. Beſides all theſe thinges, the very circumſtaunces of time, place, perſon, and maner of dooing, doo ſufficientlie ſette out the vanitie and vntrueth of this groſſe interpretation. For this Sacrament beeing inſtituted by Chriſt him ſelfe a

little before his death, in the preſence o
the Apoſtles (who had all their ſenſes ſa
tiſfied, in the beholding, hearing, and fee
ling of the naturall bodie of our Sauiou
Chriſt) in the viſible elements of bread
and wine, he himſelfe ſitting at the tabl
with them, and not onely in their hearing
ſpeaking theſe woordes, but alſo in thei
ſight and preſence actuallie breaking
the bread, it coulde not be that that bread
offered vnto them, as the pledge of his bo
die, ſhoulde be his naturall bodie or bodi
of fleſh: vnleſſe you will ſaye, that Chriſ
had two bodies, one ſitting at the Table,
inſtituting the action of the Supper, and
adminiſtring the ſame in his own perſon,
and an other borne in his handes, and de
liuered vnto the Apoſtles, than the which
what can be, not onely more abſurde and
blaſphemous, in reſpect of our Sauiour
Chriſt himſelfe, he being by this means
made a monſter, and not become man, but
alſo more vnprofitable or vncertain to vs,
as which might iuſtly prouoke vs to dout
whether of his bodies were crucified for
our tranſgreſſions: And thus as wee doo,
for good cauſes before ſpecified, as you ſee
reiect this groſe ſenſe, ſo for the inſtructi-

on

n of the ignorãunt, and strengthening of
he weake, we wil in a fewe lines putte
owne the true meaning of these worꝛdes.
Foꝛ the better perfoꝛmaunce whereof I
woulde haue this to bee noted in the first
lace, which I am sure also no man of soũd
udgement can well deny, that all wooꝛds
nd sayings whatsoeuer, must be expoun-
ed, accoꝛding to the subiect, argument,
ꝛ matter whereof they intreat: and ther-
ꝛe these wooꝛdes also, speaking particu-
arly of the Loꝛdes supper, must of neces-
itie be vnderstoode of the Sacrament of
he bodie and bloud of our Sauioꝛ Chꝛist,
xhibited vnto vs in that supper. Other-
wise wee must saye, that Chꝛist spake of
ne thing, and meant an other, which as
t might be iniurious to our selues, wee
ot knowing which way to take Chꝛistes
woꝛdes, so shoulde it accuse him foꝛ want
f plaine dealing, which potage differeth
ot muche from blasphemie against his
erson. Secondlie, I would haue this to
e remembꝛed, that seeing all, one and o-
her, both we, and our aduersaries, confes
hese wooꝛdes to be spoken of the Sacra-
ment, wee must not gather that the woꝛd
odie is otherwise attributed to the bꝛead

than

than the nature and qualitie (as a manne
would say) of sacraments will beare: for th
if we should grant that, wee might easilie
destroy and ouerthrow al the sacraments,
that either haue bene or are in the Church
of God, because in this behalfe or respect
there is a like proportion to bee obserued
in one, as in al, and if one be defaced in re
spect of a wrong sense, the rest can hardly
or not at all stande vpright. For sith the
scripture speaking of Sacraments, vseth
one ordinarie and common kinde of speach
to them all, what reason can there be she
wed, that the words in one sacrament be
ing vnderstoode so, the selfe-same wordes
shoulde not haue the selfe-same sense and
meaning in other? Thirdly, that this is
the nature of all sacraments, that the ele
ments and rites vsed in the same, be true
and effectuall, not signes onelie, but testi
monies and pledges also of those thinges,
for the signifieng and subiecting of which
vnto our senses, they were ordayned, o
therwise the nature of a sacrament should
be ouerthrowen, which consisteth of an
outwarde and visible element, and of
an inward and inuisible grace, and wee
spoiled of our faith, which is not, ne ought

not

not to bee occupied about those grosse and earthlie matters, but vpon spirituall and heauenly things only. And yet when I vse this word (signe) I woulde not bee taken as though I meant, that they are bare, vaine, or vnprofitable signes, such as painters commonly vse to make, but euen thus far forth effectuall, that it is no more true & certaine, that we see the same with our eies, touch them with our handes, receiue them with our mouths and eat them, than that it is also as true & certaine, that the Lord exhibiteth and offereth vnto vs, yea, and giueth vs also, whatsoeuer they represent vnto vs, that is, the very bodie and bloud of our sauior Christ & the fruits & effects flowing from the same, to be the spirituall food of our soules, to the full possession of eternall life. These rules being thus euen obserued, I gather & put downe this true and holie sense of these wordes: This is my bodie, that is to say, that the bread which Christ tooke, blessed, brake, and gaue vnto his disciples, appointing the same to bee vsed, as the element of this action, and to bee continued in his Church, in such forme and sort as he did institute it, vntill his comming againe,

is

is sacramentally and spiritually, beeing receiued and eaten by faith, a sure signe, and an effectuall pledge, that Christs body is become the spirituall foode of our soules. And I vse these woordes, sacramentally and spiritually, that thereby I might meete with their grosse slaunder, who, when they heare of a sign, and a thing signified, saye, that wee doo euacuate and make of no force the Lordes supper. No, wee are so farre off from holding any such conclusion, that wee knowe, beleeue, and confesse, that the faithfull and duelie prepared communicants, doo besides the outward signes and elements truelye receiue by the meane of faith, after a spirituall sort, that which is represented by the outward elemenes, to wit, whole Christ, with all his giftes and graces. And yet for the dooing of this, we do not pull Christes bodie out of heauen, or else imagine either Transubstantiation, or any such like deuise, but onely thinke vpon and beleeue, the sacramentall conjunction of the signe, and the thing signified, for those thinges can not stand with the trueth of Christes manhoode, as hath beene before shewed, neither indeede are they necessarie to sal-

uation.

uation, because that to the ende, we may be made partakers of christ, it is not of necessitie required, that his bodie shoulde be really present vppon earth, but it rather behoueth vs, by the power of the Holie ghost, and thorowe faith, to mount vppe into heauen, and there to lay hold of him, that wee may sit with him in the heauenlie places, which in this life can not bee performed in anye other sorte, than in a spirituall maner, and thorow faith, which faith is begotten and confirmed in vs by the holie-ghost, wherevnto hee vseth as instrumentes, the preachyng of Gods worde, and the administration and participation of the Sacraments, by which all our senses, are euen as it were, prouoked and pressed, wholie to possesse Christ himselfe. So that you see I doo figuratiuely expounde these woordes, and not grosselie, wherevnto I am drawne also, partlie by the very dealing of the Papists themselues, who doo not, either in the wine of the supper, the other part of this Sacrament, eyther in Baptisme, the other Sacrament of the church (which two alone God hath giuen vnto it) acknowledge anie such grosse Transubstantiati-

of in our corruption, we hardly conceiuing it now in our regeneration & newe birth, so coulde it not haue bin performed in the godhead alone. Not that I meane, that GOD was not able to haue forgiuen the sinnes of his people, and to haue released them from condemnation, and restored them to euerlasting life, but that GOD could not by suffering, because his essence and nature, is altogither impassible, haue suffered anye thing for our redemption. Wherefore, for as much as, the question betweene the Transubstantiators and vs, is not nowe, of the presence of Christes deitie in the Sacrament, but of the presence of his humane body, we say, and flatly affirme it also, that if we shoulde graunt this, yet could it no whit at all preiudice vs, neither coulde they gaine their cause thereby, for vnlesse they can proue Christ, as he is man, to be omnipotent, and euery where (which thing they shall neuer bee able to doo) they haue saide as much, as if they had saide nothing at all. But let vs for reasoning sake graunt them this muche, that Christ as hee is man, were omnipotent, euen as GOD the Father, or hee himselfe in respect of his Godhead

is:

is: Dooth it therefore followe, that becauſe hee can doo euerie thing, hee therefore either will doo the ſame, or indeede dooth it? I ſuppoſe verilye, no. For beſides that, in Schooles it is commonlie ſaide, *a poſſe ad eſſe*, the conſequence or reaſon is not good, which were ſufficient aunſweare to this friuolous and vaine obiection, mannes reaſon in the blindneſſe and corruption of it, beeing endued wyth ſtrength and force enough to aunſweare the ſame: beſides this, I ſay, wee that are truelie taught of GOD, both by his worde and ſpirite, do knowe, that though wee beleeue, that the Lorde can doo whatſoeuer pleaſeth him both in heauen and in earth, which ſerueth wonderfully to magnifie hys almightie power in the exceeding excellencie thereof, and greatlie to ſtrengthen our weake faith, in the dayes of our calamities and diſtreſſes, yet notwythſtanding we firmelie beleeue, that hee will not onelie doo nothing, but that hee can not doo anie thing in regarde of vs, contrarie vnto that will of his, that hee hath reuealed for vs in his word. For euen as a manne of might on earth, hauing giuen foorth hys ſpeache of aſſu-

tance in the woorde of a Prince or Christian, though perhappes to one farre inferiour to himselfe, is yet notwythstanding tied thereby, not as in respect of his power, for that remaineth as greate after as before, but as in regarde of his credite, and the persons to whome hee hath by his woorde after a sorte, as it were bounde himselfe: so is it wyth the Lord to vsward. And the reason of this is, not the abridgement or shortening of his power, (for be it farre from mortall men, to presume in any thing, though neuer so litle, to restrain the eternal power of the immortall God) but because his will and power (I meane of the same, as they are reuealed to vs by his woorde, and particularlie by his promises made vnto vs therin concerning the same) be in respect of vs, so conioyned and knit together, that looke whatsoeuer hee will doo, that hee can doo, and looke whatsoeuer he can do, that hee will doo. Oh howe vnreasonable is this, that wee will giue earthlie Potentates leaue, because of their high callings and excellent wisedome, that wee suppose to bee in them nowe and then; to hedge in the bounds of their power and authori-

tie,

tie, by their woordes at their owne pleaſure, and will not graunt or yeelde ſo muche to the Almightie? Surelie there is very great and good reaſon to the contrarie, for as for menne, by reaſon of the blindeneſſe and ignorauncie of their owne heartes they can not well tell when it is good, either to ſtraiten or enlarge themſelues, whereas GOD, by reaſon of the fulneſſe of goodneſſe that is in him can not chooſe but doo good, whether he inlarge or abridge himſelfe. But to make all this plaine, by one or two examples in ſteade of manie, we are all perſwaded, that God can not drowne the worlde anie more, with the waters of an vniuerſall floud, becauſe wee knowe by his woorde he will not, for the more certaine and aſſured ſealing vppe of the ſame in our heartes, and not for anie diſcredite vnto him, or ſhortening of his arme and power, hee hath not onelie geuen vs his comfortable and ſweete woorde of promiſe, but hath ſette his bowe in the cloudes, to bee a moſte effectuall pledge of the ſame vnto vs. Agayne, wee all doo knowe and beleeue, that though GOD, in reſpect both of himſelfe, and his almighty Gen.9.12,13,&c

power, with whome all thinges, yea, the moſt hardeſt, are poſſible, can if he would ſaue all men, yet we feare not to ſaye and affirme, that in reſpect of vs hee can not ſaue all menne, becauſe wee knowe by his reuealed will in his woorde, that hee will not ſaue them all. For ſome, as well for the manifeſtation of hys iuſtice and iudgement againſt all vngodlineſſe, muſt bee the veſſelles ordayned for deſtruction, as well as others alſo for the declaration of his mercie, in ſauing whom hee will, veſſelles of ſaluation and eternall life. And euen the like maie we conclude, touching this matter of the Supper, namelie, that though wee were perſwaded or ſhoulde graunt, againſt all trueth and reaſon, that Chriſt, as hee is GOD might doo what hee woulde, or as hee is man, might bee euery where, yet becauſe hee hath reuealed the contrarye in his woorde, and namelie, that hee will haue hys bodye to bee circumſcriptible and tied to a place, to wit, Heauen, yea, which is more, to a certaine place in heauen (for though Chriſt as in reſpect of hys eternall Godhead, fill Heauen and earth, and the heuen of heuens is not able

to

to conteine him, yet in reſpect of his humane bodie, though it be glorified, he is (& muſt be conteined in ſome part of the heauens) that therefore it can be no iniury at all to him, neither any debaſing of his omnipotent power, to ſay that now he cannot be bodilie in the ſacrament, much leſſe bodilie in ſo manie ſacraments, as be celebrated and miniſtred in ſo ſundrie and infinit places at one time, no more than it is to God the father, in ſaieng that now he cannot drowne the world, or ſaue the reprobat, as hath beene before declared.

Thus much I thinke ſufficient and inough to all theſe obiections, being willing heere to finiſh this preſent ſhort treatiſe, ſauing that I haue thought good in this place to adde (euen as a chalenge to the aduerſe partie, and as matter of neceſſarie inſtruction, to ſuch as either be ſimplie ignorant (for as for the malicious blinde, it is almoſt impoſſible to reclame them) or doo alreadie in ſome meaſure ſee the truth) theſe three points following.

1 Firſt, that I am readie in all holy loue largelie to anſwer anie thing that chriſtianlie ſhall be further obiected concerning this queſtion: I ſay chriſtianlie obiected:

for if anie shall either curiouslie or captiouslie propound anie thing, I thinke it most conuenient, rather to leaue such in their owne follie for a season, till it shall please God, at some one time or other, euen extraordinarilie as it were, to make them to see the same, if it shall so please him, than to spend time, and to trauell in satisfieng of their vaine curiosities.

2 Secondlie, that though this point of transubstantiation, brought in by papists, be great and grosse concerning the matter of the supper, yet that they faile not alone heerein, which might perhaps make their heresie lesse heinous, but holde manie moe errors concerning that point, some of them as palpable, if not more grosse and blasphemous than this, and some of them lesse. To pursue them all, and in a large sort, I minde not at this present, because it hath beene alreadie performed by men of great excellencie, & the Lord may heerafter giue a more fit occasion, & yet I will rehearse & touch a few, desiring the godlie reader, with all holie wisdome, to consider both of them, and the rest of that sort.

1 First, in that they make it a sacrifice propitiatorie (as they call it) for the quicke

and

nd the dead: by which they doo not one- ie ſcorne God, & deride men, whileſt they nake men beleeue, that God will be plea- ed with ſuch odde deuiſes, and that his uſtice ſhall be anſwered with the works f our owne inuention, cauſing vs alſo o thinke that ſinne is no heinous thing hat can be expiated and doone away by he offering vp a poore thinne cake, as hough that ſpirituall and innumerable ffenſes might be taken away with bodi- ie exerciſes, and that not of a holie and nnocent man, but manie times of one of he wooſt amongſt the people: but vtter- ie alſo euacuat by that means, and make of no force the eternall preeſthood and ſa- rifice of our ſautour Chriſt, which conſi- ſteth ſpeciallie in this, that he hath once for all vpon the altar of the croſſe, offered vp himſelfe vnto God the father, a full and ſufficient ſacrifice for the ſinnes of the people, as the apoſtle plainelie proo- ueth in manie places of his Epiſtle to the Hebrues. But no maruell that they ſhould annihilat and deface Chriſtes offi- ces, which deſtroy his natures, and by conſequent his whole perſon alſo (as theſe men doo by confounding the proprieties

of

of either nature, as hath beene before de
clared) yea and ouerthrow all their own
religion: for if the ſacrifice of the maſſe
(as they call it) will doo away all ſinne
what neede wee regard praier to dead
ſaints, auricular confeſſion, the popes ſu
premacie, and a thouſand more ſuch abho
minations, ſeeing that by ſetting a ſoule
preeſt on worke, they may haue full for
giuenes? and why ſhould we eſteeme par
dons, indulgences, and ſuch like traſh and
trumperie? nay rather, why ſhould they
not liue as they luſt, not onlie as epicures
but as brute beaſts, ſeeing he may be aſſu
red for mony, that that which another per
formeth for him, ſhall be auailable both to
bodie and ſoule, and that to eternall ſalua
tion: but fie vpon all ſuch beaſtlie & blaſ
phemous dotages.

2 Secondlie, there is but a little leſſe
leauen in that matter that they hold of vn
comitancie, by which they haue not onelie
ſpoiled the people of the vſe of the cuppe,
which both by Chriſtes owne inſtitution,
& by his expreſſe commandement, ſaieng:
Drinke ye all of this, doth in all truth and
vprighenes belong vnto them, and by con
ſequent alſo robbed them of the frutes &

effects

effects of his bloud, as the forgiueneſſe of
their ſinnes, and their full reconcilement
to almightie God: but alſo accuſed our
ſauior Chriſt of follie and raſhneſſe, inſti-
uting more ſignes in the ſacrament of his
ſupper, than he needed. And all this they
haue done vnder this ſhadow, that becauſe
no bodie is without bloud, and they haue
before (preſuppoſing that the bread is tur-
ned into the bodie, as in deed if men will
preſuppoſe, either vnpoſſible or vntrue
things, euerie thing will follow of it) ea-
ten the bodie, therefore muſt it needs fol-
low, that they haue drunke alſo his bloud.
Tell vs I pray you, why might not we as
well ſay, reſpecting alwaies the ſacramēt,
that when men haue drunke of the cuppe,
they haue eaten his fleſh: for if the par-
taking of the one include the other, or if
whole Chriſt, as they ſay, be in euery part
of the viſible elements, then why doo not
men receiuing the wine, as well receiue
the bodie as the bloud? or why may not we
ſay, that eating is drinking, or drinking is
eating? or why doo not they themſelues
miniſter it in the element of wine one-
ly, as well as in the bread alone? or why
may not we, euen beating them with their
owne

owne assertions, of an vnbloudie sacrifice,
and of the reall presence of Christes natu-
rall bodie in the same, say and affirme that
the bodie may be there without the bloud
or the bloud without the bodie: for if the
sacrifice conteine the naturall and fleshie
bodie of our sauior, and yet of it selfe it is
vnbloudie; we see no reason why we may
not saflie conclude, that the bodie is there
without bloud: But I know not whether
herein I should blame thē for their beast-
linesse, or reprooue them for their pride
that dare thus presumptuouslie alter the
Lords very ordinance and institution.

3 Thirdlie their adoration is as corrup
and filthie, whilest they cause men t
commit grosse and palpable idolatrie, i
falling downe before a peece of bread
(what doo I say? I know not whether I
may call it by that name or no, for it ma
be disputed of, whether their masse cak
be bread) and worshipping a wafer cak
the worke of mens hands. And if it wer
a foule fault in the Gentils, to turne th
glorie of the incorruptible God, int
the similitude of the image of a cor
ruptible man, and of birds, and four
footed beasts, and of creeping thinge

Rom. 1. 23.

all which notwithstanding had life in thē, and were in deed the creatures of GOD, what must it be in the papists, who transforme his wonderfull maiesty into a mustie or whory cake, which though it be kept but a small while, is yet notwithstanding subiect to putrifaction and wormes? But suppose it were Christes body, as they say it is, yet I affirme, that they may not adore Christes bodie alone, yea and that they cannot worship the same of it selfe, without horrible idolatrie, wherof also the reason is plaine and euident, namelie because it is a creature, to which it is not lawfull to giue that honor that is due vnto the creator alone, because he being ielous ouer his owne glory, will not haue it giuen to anie other. For though it be true, that Christ as he is god, is to be worshipped as his father: yea & Christ God & man in one person is to be adored, yet we cannot without great sin, and greeuous offense against God & his word, worship the humanity or manhood of our sauior Christ onlie. And if they will say, as I my selfe haue heard some of thē ignorantly affirme, ỳ if Christ God & man may be worshipped, therefore christ also as he is mā may be worshipped:

I answer, that besides, it is a fallacie or deceit in reasoning, called in schooles *Fallacia diuisionis*, it is a flat contrarie to the truth of christian religion, which teacheth vs, that many things may be spoken of the person of our sauior Christ, which can not rightlie or truelie be said of either nature, and the reason is, because as the vnitie of the person must be maineteined & vpheld, so must godlie men haue an especiall regard, that they confound not the seuerall proprieties of either nature. To make this plaine by a point or two. A man may saflie say, that Christ God and man in one person was crucified on the crosse, & died for our sinnes, whereof also this is the verie true and sufficient reason, because in his whole person he performed the worke of our redemption, and not in either of the natures alone, or by it selfe: but nowe if heerevpon a man should say and conclude, therfore Christ God was crucified for our sinnes, besides that he should vtter an errour or heresie in christian religion, hee should speake blasphemie against God, whose nature (as we haue said heertofore) is altogither impossible. Likewise a man may saflie say and affirme, that the virgin

Marie

Marie was the mother of our Sauiour Chriſt, as hee is God and man in one perſon: the reaſon is, becauſe that euen from the verie moment of his bleſſed conception in the wombe of the virgine, the Godhead and the manhood, were inſeperablie ioyned and knit togeather in that one perſon Ieſus Chriſt, who is God ouer all, to be bleſſed for euer and euer. Romans.9.5. But if hereupon a man would inferre, therefore ſhe is or may bee called the mother of God, beſides that hee ſhoulde ſpeake againſt the groundes and principles of ſounde faith, which teacheth vs, that as chriſt in reſpect of his manhood was without father, ſo in reſpect of his godhead he was without mother, he ſhold ſpeak very proudly of fleſh & bloud, and very baſely of God, as though that the creature, were in time before the creator, or God could not bee without the helpe of poore and weake women.

4 To deale with the reſeruation, circumgeſtation, or carieng it about, and with many other odde toies of their own inuention, and largely lay out the inconueniences therof, would require ſome proper and fit diſcourſe for that purpoſe, but I wil reſerue it til another time, making haſt now

to handle that, which ſhalbe as the laſt, ſo in my iudgement, not the leaſt profitable part of this treatie, and that is, how a man ſhould drawe neere vnto ſuch reuerent miſteries, to gods glory, and his owne good, and howe hee may beſt come, to reape and receiue fruite and comforte by the ſame, ſpeciallie ſith it pleaſeth God, to offer to him ſuch excellent graces therby, wherein I mind not to deal largely, becauſe, as you ſee thorowe all this diſcourſe, I profeſſe breuitie and ſhortnes, and to deale fully & perfectlie I cannot, both by reaſon of the excellencie of the thinges to bee handled, and alſo by meane of the maime, that wee find in our knowledg in this life, in which we know in part, and prophecie in part, as the Apoſtle ſayth. And yet not to ſaye ſomewhat, ſith the Lord hath made me to feele ſomewhat, were not onelie to deface the graces that God in the riches of his mercie, hath beſtowed vpon me poore and miſerable wretch ý I am, but to defraude my good brethren, and the people of God, of ſome eyther profitable inſtruction, or ſweete comfort, that the Lord hath beene pleaſed to acquaint mee withall: wherein ſetting Gods glorie, chieflie before mine

1. Corinth 13.9.

eies,

eies, and the good of his children, I will truſting in the multitude of his mercies aſſaye, to vtter that little, that I my ſelfe in ſome meaſure feele in this matter.

The thinges, that euerie man, is principallie to deale in, concerning this poynt, may, in my minde, bee well reduced, into three ſhort heads or titles.

Firſt, becauſe no manne is to doo a thyng without deepe conſideration before hande of the matter hee taketh in hande, wee are to ſee what hee is to perfourme, before the communicatyng or receauing of this Sacrament, and this I will call in one terme, preparation. 1

Secondlie, becauſe in the action and execution of euery good and lawfull thing, a man is to haue his mind wholy bent and ſet vpon the ſame, we are to weigh, what he is to do or thinke vpon, in the time, and at the verie inſtant of receiuing, and this I will name meditation. 2

Thirdly, becauſe there is no good thing ſo wel done, but ỳ pleaſure or profit in time afterward, may therby redound to the doer yea becauſe ther is nothing ſo wel done by men, but ỳ by reaſon of the imperfection of mans nature, ſom thing muſt ſtil be added, 3

we are to looke what he is to do, after the time of receiuing, and this I will call action or practiſe.

Preparation which is the firſt, reſpecteth either God or man. Now that which concerneth God, is compzehended vnder ſound knowledge, true faith, & vnfeigned repentance, as that which concerneth man is compziſed vnder ſincere loue. And I call them ſound, true, vnfeigned, and ſincere, & yet not perfect, becauſe perfection properlie ſignifieng that, vnto which nothing can be added, can not be found in man, during this natural life of his. And this I ſpeake, partlie to ſtoppe the mouthes of ſuch as dzeam of a perfection in this life, to groſſe an erroz to bee largelye confuted, becauſe Gods wozs is moſt plaine in that behalfe, & the manifold imperfections, of thoſe that would ſeeme moſt perfect, do plentifullie improue the ſame: and partly, as in a comfoztable ſozt to teach vs, that our imperfections ſhould not hinder vs, from dzawing nigh thereto, (ſo that we do not ſolace and feed our ſelues in them) ſeeing that otherwiſe the ſacrament ſhould ſtand vs in no ſteed, if we were not vnperfect, becauſe it is a holie helpe, and ſingular ſuccour ozdeined

deined by God him ſelfe, againſt our natu-
rall infirmitie and weakenes.

1 By knowledge I vnderſtand not anie humaine ſciences, or worldly faculties, or a meane inſight into the grounds of chriſtian religion, but an aſſured vnderſtanding, as of the moſt materiall pointes of our faith, (for example, of the vnitie of the godhead, of the Trinitie in the perſons, of the names, nature, perſon and offices of our ſauiour &c.) ſo ſpecially of this point of the Lordes ſupper it ſelfe, (for bee it farre from vs, to knowe others, and to bee ignorant in that whereof wee are to bee partakers) we keeping our ſelues farre off and free, from all erronious opinions, either of Tranſubſtantiation, conſubſtantiation, or any ſuch like, either beſides or againſt the will of God, reuealed in his word: which as it muſt onely be the direction of all our actions, ſo muſt it alwaies bee the rule of our religion alone. And this ſound knowledge of the grounds and principles of chriſtian religion, and that in ſuch ſort as god hath reuealed thē vnto vs in his word, muſt of neceſsity go before al other things, both becauſe it is as a man would ſay, the foundation to the houſe, & the roote to the

tree, and alſo becauſe if wee know not the good will and pleaſure of our GOD, we can neuer either beleeue or doo the ſame: for euen as in worldlie matters, if men bee ſet about the thinges, they haue no ſkill in, they knowe not where to begin, or howe to proceede, or when to make an ende, ſo in ſpirituall thinges, they are much more blinde and backwarde, for in outwarde thinges of this life, men may ſomewhat bee holpen, by the light of reaſon, and the liuelines of their owne witte, but in the matters of God, the more they rely or leane vpon that, the further off they are from atteining the trueth, becauſe the Apoſtle telleth vs, that the naturall man perceiueth not the things of the ſpirit of God, for they are fooliſhnes vnto him, neither can he know them becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned. And in another place: the wiſdome of the fleſh is enmitie againſt God, for it is not ſubiect to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

1.Corinth.2. 14.

Roman.8.7.

2 By faith I meane, not only a generall beliefe, of all the canonicall books of ỹ old & new teſtament, or a grounded knowledg alone, of the points & principles of chriſtian religion, & the truth thereof, for many

wicked

wicked men proceede ſo farre, and the Apoſtle James telleth vs, that the diuels beleeue and tremble, but an aſſured perſwaſion, and particular application, as of al theſe things whatſoeuer, that the Lord hath reuealed in his worde, ſo ſpeciallie of his promiſes contained in the ſame, concerning either this life, or the life to come (for though our faith do generally reſpect the whole word, yet is it moſt ſpecially directed to the promiſes that god hath made vs in Chriſt, in whome all the promiſes of God are, yea and amen) euerie particular perſon beeing fullie aſſured, and certainelie perſwaded of this, that as the Lorde hath doone and promiſed the ſame, to, and for others, ſo hath hee doone and promiſed it, particularlie, to, and for himſelfe. So that we may plainely perceiue, that this faith is neceſſarie, to euery one that ſhall communicate, both becauſe that otherwiſe they being on the earth, can not take hold of Chriſt in heauen, and ſtedfaſtly apply him and all his merites to themſelues, that ſo he may become the ſpirituall foode of their ſoules, nouriſhing them in the moſt certaine hope of eternall ſaluation (for faith is it by which alone, they may

Iames 2.19.

2. Corinth. 1.20.

propriate vnto them selues particularlie, Christ Jesus and all his graces, to the assured feelyng of the free pardon and full forgiuenesse of all their sinnes on the one side, and the imputation of Christs righteousnesse on the other side) and also that thereby, they may bee fullie certified in their owne consciences, that that which they doe, either in the administration or participation of that holy action, or Sacrament of the Lordes bodie and bloud, is acceptable before GOD, and profitable to them selues, because without fayth it is impossible to please hym, and agayne: Whatsoeuer is not of faith, that selfe same is sinne: which properties indeede, or effectes rather, if a man surelye haue, they shall make his fayth to differ, from all the vaine imaginations and swimming conceipts, of diuels and wicked men whatsoeuer.

Hebrues.11.6.
Roman.14.23.

3 By repentaunce I vnderstande, a holie alteration and chaunge of oure mindes (for good reason is there, that where sinne begynneth, from thence also shoulde proceede our conuersion or turnyng to GOD) consisting of a sincere hatred of all our former sinnes and iniqui-

iniquities whatſoeuer both generall and particular, and of a ſounde loue, of all righteouſneſſe and well-dooing, both generall and particular: all which muſt in vs proceede from the right reuerence and louing feare, of the maieſtie of almightie God in our heartes, which holie affection dooth euerye daye by little and little worke in vs, the forſaking of our ſelues, and the ſubduing of the ſinfull luſtes and affections of our owne fleſh, to the end we may wholie reſigne and giue ouer our ſelues, to be guided and gouerned by the ſpirite of God, in the ſincere ſeruice and worſhip of his maieſtie, and in the Chriſtian perfourmaunce of the holie dueties of charitie one of vs towardes an other, wee our ſelues, not onelie ſtanding vppe and ſtriuing againſt our generall iniquities, but alſo againſt our particular ſinnes, yea againſt theſe ſpeciall tranſgreſſions, that moſt preuaile in vs againſt the good will of our God: whereby no doubt God ſhall be greatly glorified, whileſt hee maketh his mightie power to appeare, in ſtrengthening our woonderfull weakeneſſe, againſt ſome particular wickedneſſe, and wee our ſelues ſhall reape comforte, aſſuring

ring our selues of this, that hee that hath strengthened vs against some one sinne, will also assiste vs against other, and so
Philip.1.6. make the good woorkes that he hath begunne in vs, perfect, euen vntill the day of Christ. So that hereby wee may see, that he which feeleth himselfe truelie and vnfainedlie changed, in the affections of his minde, for his former iniquities, not onelie loathing his sinnes, but euen himselfe for his sinnes sake, and carrieth with him this holy purpose, neuer, thorow gods assistaunce to committe the same, or anie suche like against GOD or men, maie, not onely be assured of his vnfained repentaunce, and so by consequent of the forgiueneese of his sinnes, but also with boldeneese, and yet notwithstanding with reuerence in respect of GOD, and with humbleneese of minde, in respect of himselfe, may drawe neere to the partaking of those holie mysteries.

4 By loue, which is the thing that concerneth men, I doo not onelie vnderstand, the vnfained pardoning and forgiuing of others, that haue anie manner of waie trespassed against vs, but also sound reconciliation after offences committed, one

one of vs towardes an other, yea I meane further by loue, which properlie is an inward affection of the heart, the ſincere and outwarde teſtifieng of the ſame by woordes, deedes, countenaunces, and other meanes, as the Lorde ſhall geue occaſion, and our abilitie ſerue to expreſſe the ſame, and that not vnto our friendes onelie, (for what great thing doo wee if wee loue them that loue vs? Matth.5.46.47. But generallie to all men, though vnto ſome in greater meaſure, as to the houſholde of faith, our wiues, children, and parents, &c: and to ſome in leſſe meaſure, as to thoſe that bee yet wythout, and bee somewhat further off by nature and kinred, yea, and to our ennemies alſo, which is somewhat more: againſt which, becauſe wee doo wholly ſtriue while wee are in the corruption of oure nature, and bee woonderfullye backeward to the ſame, euen then when GOD hath in ſome meaſure aduaunced our regeneration in vs, there lieng lurking wythin vs the cinders of Hatred and Diſ-like, readye to breake foorthe into a flame, as occaſion and matter ſhall bee miniſtred, wee ſhall doo verye well to gather as Galat.6.10.

many

many reasons to induce vs to the practise thereof, as possibly wee can, that so by them, as it were by strong cordes, wee may be drawen and tied, as a man would say, to the execution of the same. First therefore wee haue GOD in sundry places of his worde, layeng that duetie vppon vs, To loue them that hate vs, to bless them that curse vs, and to pray for them that persecute vs. Secondlie, wee haue his owne example concurring with hys commaundement, bee practising the same to vs, that hee would haue vs to doo to others, namelie, louing vs, when wee were and are his ennimies. Thirdlye, wee haue the example of our Sauiour Christe, cloathed with one nature accomplishing the same, praying also to the Father to forgiue them, that putte him to death. And least anie man shoulde thinke, that that which Christe did in this case, woulde not bee performed in and by them, eyther by reason of Christes singular excellencie, or the difficultie and impossibilitie of the thing it selfe, the Lorde hath in the fourth place, for the ouercomming of that temptation, sette before vs sundrie of his seruaunts, who

Matth. 5.44. Luke 6.27,24.

Roman. 5.10. Matth. 5.45. 1. Iohn 4.10.

Luke 23.34.

who beeing men like vnto vs, in all respects, haue yet notwythstanding in the dayes of their flesh doone the same, as we see particularlie in Stephan. Fiftlie, the verye Sacrament it selfe, and the elements in the same leade vs thereto, For wee that are manie are one bread and one bodie, because wee are all partakers of one bread at the Lordes boorde, euen as that bread wee eate of there, is made of manie graines, and yet maketh but one loafe. Lastlie, our owne good should carrie vs forward to this, because thereby wee prouide well for our selues, that so wee might feele the forgiuenesse of our sinnes before GOD, our Sauiour telling vs in plaine wordes, That if wee doo forgiue men their trespasses, our heauenlie Father wil also forgiue vs. And though it bee true, that wee can and doo greatlie aggrauate other mens sinnes against vs, as for example, hee hath taken away my good name, he hath spoiled me of my goodes, hee hath killed my father, husband, children, and a thousand suche like: and what hainous offences be these? Yet if GOD would geue vs grace, vprightlie to looke into our owne sinnes, committed

Acts 7.60

1. Corinth. 10. 17

Matth. 6. 14

committed eyther agaynst other men, or Gods owne maiestie, wee shall finde, that wee haue good cause offered, to be ready to remitte: For if men offend vs, wee doo in as great points offend others. And though that were not true, yet wee cannot denie, but that wee doo more highlie displease Almightie GOD than men can, or doo displease vs, and that not onelie in the notoriousnesse of our sinnes, but euen in a dailie and continuall course of iniquitie, and in an infinite multitude of transgressions also. What a fearefull thing will this bee in our owne heartes, that wee woulde gladlie haue God mercifull vnto vs, in forgiuing most greeuous and innumerable transgressions, and wee will not remitte small offences, and sinnes seldome tymes committed? By this wee doo nothing else but cast awaie the sure seale and earnest pennie, as it were, that our sinnes are forgiuen vs before GOD, and refuse a certaine pledge, that our prayers and all other good things that come from vs, are in Christes obedience accepted in his sight, yea, and moste iniuriouslie treade vnder our filthie feete, Gods worde, Gods example, Gods

sacra-

ſacraments, and many other tokens of his grace, and laſtlie, pull vpon vs a fearful vengeance from God, to be manifeſted in this life, and in the life to come. And therefore I beſeeche all the godlie, that haue care of their ſaluation, to looke heedilie to this point.

Meditation, which is the ſecond thing, and is to be vſed ſpecially in the tyme of the celebration of the Lordes Supper, conſiſteth chiefly in theſe points, to wit, in regarding the outwarde elementes of the Lordes Supper, that is to ſaye, the breade and the wine, and in conſidering the rites vſed, in, and aboute the ſame, as the breaking of the Breade and the pouring foorth of the Wine, and ſo forth. For though the outward things are not the matters that wee ſhoulde ſtand vppon, yet, becauſe by them, it pleaſeth the Lorde, as it were, by the hand, to leade vs vnto right excellent thinges, namelie, by them to ſette foorth vnto our Soules, the crucifieng of Chriſtes bodie, the ſheading of his bloude, and ſo foorth, and all for our tranſgreſſions, that therefore they ſhoulde not bee ſleightlie paſſed ouer, wythout verye deepe and

due

due consideration of the same. And then because wee must not stay below on the earth, nor be busied in beholding of earthlie things onelie, but must by faith rise vp to heauen as it were, there to behold the abundant riches of Gods spirituall graces, offered and giuen to the faithfull, in, with, & by the outward elements, we are thoroghlie to wey what great mercies the Lord setteth before vs, in that holie and spirituall banket, which though partlie for the woorthinesse of the giuer, and partlie also for the excellencie of themselues, as also by the want and weakenesse of our blinde and dull vnderstanding, they cannot be sufficiently conceiued, much lesse vttered, may yet in my mind be brought into these foure points following, as most materiall and principall.

1 God setteth before our eies in that holie action, first Christes death and passion, together with the benefits & effects which we reape thereby, and namelie the remission and full forgiuenesse of all our sinnes, together with the imputation of Christes righteousnesse vnto vs, and the assured possession of eternall life: for we doo no more verilie behold the bread broken, and the

wine

wine powred foorth in our bodily sight and presence, than wee do or ought by the eie of our faith, to beholde the bodie of Christ crucified, and his bloud shead vppon the crosse, for the forgiuenesse of our sinnes: neither are wee more fullie or particularlie put in possession of the bread and wine, when wee haue eaten and druncke the same, than wee are of Christ and all his merits, then when by a liuelie and stedfast faith we lay hold of him, and the most excellent graces, that in him are offered vnto vs, applieng them all particularly to our own souls, which yet that they might be more effectually pledged vppe in vs, it pleased the Lord to appoint, not onlie that the bread should be broken, and the wine powred foorth, but that euery one of vs, should seuerallie by him selfe, and for him selfe, take it, eate it, and drincke it, &c: that so wee might bee in the more full and assured possession of hym and his graces.

2 Secondlie, the Lorde pledgeth out vnto vs therby, that ful and spirituall nourishement, that through Christ we haue, both in the outward and inward man, euen to the hope and fruition of eternall

life: for euen as verilie, as that bread and wine dooth seeme to strengthen our out-ward manne: so euen as verilie, yea more verilye by much, dooth Christe and his graces nourishe our soules: yea I saye more verilie, because that though some part of the bread and wine wee receiue, bee turned into our healthfull and profitable nourishment, and is become as it were part of our substaunce; yet some of it also passeth thorowe the panch into the priuie, but Christe remaineth alwaies a most holie and sound nutriment vnto our soules, no parte of him vanishing awaye, but hauing rather this effecte in vs, that hee is not onely turned into our substance, as the bodilie elements are in respect of our outward man; but rather wholie turning vs, as a man would say, into his most holie and blessed substance, he being not onelye a plentifull, but a pleasaunt nourishment also, bringing alwaies with him that effect to our soules, that the outwarde elements doo to our bodies, namelie giuing them all spirituall strength, and inwarde comfort, because without him, we haue nothing, nor can doo anie thing.

Iohn.15.5.

3 Thirdlie, by this meanes the Lorde propoundeth vnto vs, the myſticall vnion that is betwixt Chriſt and his church, we and hee making but one bodie of his holie congregation, hee being the head thereof, and we the particular members: by which alſo, as we are inſtructed, in our holie dueties towardes him, we attempting nothing that may tend to the preiudice, hurte, or griefe of our holie head, but endeauouring euerye thing that maye be good and acceptable before him, ſo we comfortablie conceiue the great and continuall care hee hath for vs, hee performing more effectuallie by much, the duety of headſhip vnto his ſpirituall bodie the church, than a naturall head, dooth, or can to a naturall bodie, namelie, not onelie in deuiſing for the good thereof, both in generall and in particular, but alſo in yeelding ſence and mouing vnto the whole bodie, and euerie ſeuerall member thereof, yea, quickening the ſame, and geuing together with the vnderſtanding of heauenlie care and conſcience, yea, ſome meaſure of ſtrength and power to walke therein, ſo that He dwelling in oure heartes by Fayth, wee Ephes. 3. 17.

are therby not onelie become members of his bodie, of his flesh, and of his bloud, but also he maketh vs zealous, prepared, and frutefull in euerie good worke, both towards the Lord, and one of vs towards an other.

4 Fourthlie and lastlie, the Lord deliuereth vnto vs in the vse of his supper, that holie vnitie and agreement, both outward and inward, of bodie and mind, that is and ought to be knowne, felt and continued amongst all the members of his church, whatsoeuer, or wheresoeuer they be. For euen as the bread that we are partakers of, is made of many graines, & yet maketh but one loafe, as we see, & as the wine that we drinke at the Lords table, is made of manie grapes, and yet maketh but one wine: so all the faithfull people, not onlie of one place & parish, but dispersed throughout the whole earth (notwithstanding that some through the riches of Gods mercies haue atteined more graces than other some) make in deed but one holie bodie of the church. Neither doth our being of seuerall members one of vs to another, anie more hinder our growth in this same spirituall fellowship, than the varietie of mē-

bers

bers in a naturall body hindereth the conſtituring and making of the whole bodie it ſelfe, nay rather; as we may well perceiue, it furthereth the ſame: for as the whole cannot be ſaid to be whole but in reſpect of all the parts whereof it conſiſteth, no more can this whole or holie bodie of the church, & euerie particular congregation throughout the world, concurring to the eſtabliſhing thereof: and yet ſo notwithſtanding, that the name church may as rightlie be attributed to euerie ſeuerall ſocietie of the faithfull, as the word earth to euerie part of the earth, or to ſpeake of the elements of the ſupper, the word bread, and the word wine, to euerie part of the bread & wine vſed in the ſame.

The third and laſt thing, is that which I called before, action, and is to be performed, as generallie all the daies of our life, ſo particularlie and ſpeciallie after the receiuing of the Lords ſupper. And though this come in the laſt place, yet is it not a matter of the leaſt importance, nay rather it is of ſuch great weight, that the former without it, be little auailable: for euen as in all humane ſciences, knowlege, though it be neuer ſo exquiſit, is without action & 3

practise commonlie counted but a vaine conceit, so in spirituall vnderstanding, that is muche more true, because if a man knowe neuer so muche of Gods mercies, and meditate neuer so deeply in the same, yet if that by the same he be not led, as it were, by the hand, both humbly to praise God for them, and hartily praie vnto him, for the continuance and increase of them, with grace to embrace them, and to vse them well, it is to himselfe and others as if it were nothing. Now this matter that we call action consisteth:

1 First, in earnest praier vnto God, not onelie for a cleare sight of the graces offered, because we are blind to perceiue them, but also for a liuely and continuall sucking of the same, because we doo easilie shake and smother them vp, yea, for the plentifull fructifieng of the word of God, and his sacraments in our hearres, because we our selues bee barren and ill ground, and can hardlie bring foorth good fruit, though we haue haue very much cost and labor bestowed vpon vs. And this duetie must be performed, not for the time present alone as whilest we are in the publike exercises, or for the day of communicating onelie, re-

turning

turning afterwards as filthie ſwine to our former wallow, or vncleane dogges to our vomite againe: for alas what will that auaile vs, but to a more fearefull iudgement, and iuſt condemnation, becauſe wee continue in ſin, & abuſe the meanes of our ſanctification and purging, but euen for the whole race and courſe of our liues, that as there is no day nor houre of a day going ouer our heades, wherein wee ſtand not in neede of ſome bleſſing from the Lorde, ſo there ſhould few times eſcape vs, wherein we would not do to God this duty, that we beleeue to be acceptable to him, becauſe he hath commanded it, and ſo profitable vnto our ſelues, becauſe it reacheth vnto euerie part and period, or ſtate of our whole life.

2 Secondly, in humble thankeſgiuing, as for all the vnestimable riches and treaſures of grace and godlineſſe generallie: which it pleaſeth him in his Church, and namelie by the vſe of his word and ſacraments, not onelie to offer, but alſo to beſtow vpon his people, ſo ſpecially for the death and obedience of hys Sonne, the bleſſing of all bleſſings, that is to ſaye, the moſt excellent bleſſing, the Lord beſtowing thereby vppon vs all graces both

bodilie & spirituallie: bodilie, as the sanctification of all his creatures vnto vs, which otherwise we continuing in our sinnes (as we must needs haue doone, if Christ had not died for vs) should haue bin vncleane vnto vs: and spirituall, as the forgiuenesse of our sins, the imputation of Christes righteousnesse (which we must of necessitie beleeue, because otherwise God may as well condemne vs for want of righteousnesse, as for our notorious transgressions) and manie such other particulars before recited. And that we may be the better prouoked to this great dutie of thankfulnes, it shall be good for vs, not onelie to alot vnto our selues sometime in euerie day, wherin we will take a view so far forth as we can, of all the graces of God both generall and particular, bestowed vpon our selues & others, but also deeplie to consider, first the person that giueth the same, who is the Lord of heauen and earth, mercifull no doubt euen vnto thousands of generations, to them that loue him, and keepe his commandements: secondlie the excellencie of the things bestowed, which besides that they are bodily and spirituall, temporal and eternall, arise

to

to ſuch a huge number, in the ſeuerall ſorts and great varietie of them that are not able to thinke of them, or ane one of them, according to their woorthineſſe, muche leſſe to account or number them: and thirdlie to conſider our ſelues receiuing them, to whome the Lorde freelie and of his owne goodneſſe, giueth theſe great mercies, not onelie when wee had not deſerued the leaſt of them, but euen then when euery one of vs, had deſerued eternall death and condemnation to be poured foorth vpon vs and ours.

3 And laſtlie in care and conſcience of a moſt holie and chriſtian conuerſation, that ſeeing wee are in the holie Supper made partakers by faith of Chriſts death and reſurrection, and that wee fullie perſwade our ſelues by the truth of the word, that he did not onlie die for our ſinnes, and riſe for our righteouſneſſe, but alſo perfourmed that excellent and great worke to teach vs, by his death to die to vngodlineſſe, and by his reſurrection to riſe vp to that holineſſe, that may bee acceptable before God, profitable to our brethren, and comfortable to our ſelues, wee hauing by that meanes, and to that

Roman. 4. 25.

Roman. 6. 8. Coloſſ. 3. 1.

end our ſpirituall life and being from him, that therefore we ſhould liue ſoberlie, righteouſlie, and godlie in this preſent euill world, and that in the ſound affections of our harts before God, and in words and deeds before men, that when it ſhall pleaſe him to finiſh the daies of our wearieſome pilgrimage, we ſtedfaſtlie looking for that bleſſed hope, and full fruition of eternall life, may be glorified with him in eternall bleſſednes: which thing the Lord grant vs, euen for his crucified Chriſtes ſake, to whom, with the Father, and the Holie ghoſt, three perſons and one eternall God, be giuen all honor, praiſe, power & glorie, both of vs and of all people, euen now and at all times for euer and euer. So be it.

Titus.2.12.

Romans.3.

Romans.8.
Coloss.3.

Τῷ Θεῷ δόξα.

TO THE READER.

AT the motion and request of sundrie my deere friends in the Lord, I haue thought good to put downe these two praiers following, not thereby minding, either to tie anie person to the vse of these onelie (for they may according to their seuerall necessities, conceiue some other of their owne, or practise some better forme alredie set foorth, by men of greater gifts or feeling) nor yet so to busie their minds, and to occupie their heads, as that they should be imploied in these, when the publike praiers and exercises of the church, performed by the ministers, are in hand (for be it farre from vs, when the minister (Gods mouth) speaketh from the Lord to vs, or when he as our mouth, speaketh to the Lord for vs, to haue either our hearts or our mouthes occupied about any other thing, than the reuerend hearing and consenting vnto, of such things as hee vtereth.) But that aiding the infirmitie of our brethren, such as haue not the gift to conceiue praier, and shall thinke this fit for themselues, might haue a forme to exercise themselues in, both before they repaire to the publike exercises of the church, and also after the celebration and partaking of these reuerend mysteries shall be finished.

A PRAIER TO BE SAID BEFORE *a man repaire to the partaking of the* Lords supper.

O Eternall God, and most mercifull father, I thy poore and vnwoorthie seruant doo humblie beseech thee in Iesus Christ thy deere sons name, and for his sake, graciouslie through his death and obedience, to pardon and forgiue me all my sinnes whatsoeuer, which at anie time, by thought, word, or deed, I haue, through negligence, ignorance, or knowledge, committed against thy diuine maiestie, or anie other. And because both by reason of the cursed corruption of mine owne nature, and the infinit multitude of my sinnes also, I am slow & dull of heart to beleeue, seale vp in my soule I pray thee O Lord, this great benefit of the free pardon & full forgiuenesse of all my sinnes, by the assured testimonie of thy blessed spirit, bearing record vnto my spirit that I am thy childe, and by vnfeined parddoning and forgiuing of others, which anie maner of way haue offended against me. Yea make the death and resurrection of thy sonne so powerfull & effectuall in me, that I may not onelie feele and finde in the same, the forgiuenesse of all my sinnes, both generall and particular, and the hope of eternall saluation, but also that I may be instructed thereby, all the daies of my life, more and more to die vnto sin, and dailie more & more to liue vnto righteousnes of life and holie conuersation. And forasmuch as through thy goodnesse, I haue purposed this day to communicat, in the vse of thy blessed word and sacraments, I beseech thee (good father) to pearse mine eares, to prepare my heart, yea and so to direct all the parts and powers of my body and soule, that I may not onelie reuerentlie and profitablie

hearken to thy voice, ſpeaking vnto me out of thy word, laboring all the daies of my life to conforme my ſelfe to the knowledge, faith, and obedience of the ſame, but alſo that I may aſſuredlie be made partaker of the fruites and effects of the death and paſſion of thy deere ſonne, which it pleaſeth thee in that holie ſacrament, to offer vnto me. To this end and purpoſe I beſeech thee to grant, that I be not carried away in the contemplation and conſideration of the earthly and corruptible things, obiected therein to my ſences, but that my faith may be ſet vp & raiſed to the ſpirituall beholding, aſſured feeling, and full fruition of theſe graces, which it pleaſeth thee by the ſame to offer vnto me. Giue me grace (good Lord) to bring with me a ſtedfaſt faith in the truth of thy promiſes, that by it, as by an eie, I may looke vpon, and by the ſame, as by a hand, I may apprehend Ieſus Chriſt thy ſonne, ſitting at thy right hand, to be my onelie and continuall iuſtifier, ſanctifier and redeemer. Grant me grace alſo to bring with me, as an earneſt hatred of all my former euils whatſoeuer, ſo a ſincere loue of all righteouſneſſe and well dooing, that I by the power of thy ſpirit, crucifieng the old man, with the luſts and concupiſcences therof, ſpeciallie ſuch as beare the greateſt ſway in me, may be ſtrengthened in the new man, dailie to thinke, ſpeake, and doo thoſe things which may be acceptable and well pleaſing in thy godlie preſence. And I beſeech thee further, to giue me grace to bring with me, ſound & ſincere loue towards all men, yea euen towards mine enimies, that I may not onelie forget and forgiue all the iniuries & wrongs that they haue deuiſed, ſaid or doone againſt me, but alſo pray earneſtlie vnto thy maieſtie for them, and purchaſe and procure

their

If god be a god of other

1. if if god be the god of all the earth then there is no other god for god is god to all & there is no other but him